arXiv:1408.7044v1 [math.CO] 29 Aug 2014

Two Theorems on the Range of Strategy-proof Rules on a Restricted Domain

Donald E. Campbell · Jerry S. Kelly

Abstract

Let g be a strategy-proof rule on the domain NP of profiles where no alternative Pareto-dominates any other and let g have range S on NP. We complete the proof of a Gibbard-Satterthwaite result - if S contains more than two elements, then g is dictatorial - by establishing a full range result on two subdomains of NP.

1. Introduction.
2. Notation.
3. N−Range Theorem: Part 1.
4. N−Range Theorem: Part 2.
5. M−Range Theorem.

1. Introduction.

In Campbell and Kelly (2010), we discussed losses due to manipulation of social choice rules and gave an example of a non−dictatorial rule such that, for any manipulation, no one else has a loss. Where all individual preferences are strict, that means that for any manipulation, everyone gains. We say such rules satisfy universally beneficial manipulation (UBM); this property is a weakening of Gibbard-Satterthwaite individual stra tegy-proofness.

In Campbell and Kelly (2014a), we present two characterizations of UBM rules. The proof in that paper uses structural results from the fact that a UBM rule g must satisfy strategy-proofness on the subdomain NP of all profiles with the property that no alternative Pareto-dominates any other.

In Campbell and Kelly (2014b), we derive those structural results: A rule g that is strategy-proof on NP and has range of at least three alternatives must be dictatorial. That proof, in turn, required, for two induction steps, the result that if strategy-proof g is of full range on NP it is also of full range on two special subdomains of NP. This paper completes the analysis by proving these two range results.

2. Notation.

We adopt all terminology and notation from Campbell and Kelly (2014b). In particular, we take as given a finite set X of alternatives with $|X| = m \geq 3$ and finite set $N = \{1, 2, ..., n\}$ of individuals with $n \geq 3$. A (strong) *ordering* on X is a complete, asymmetric, transitive relation on X and the set of all such orderings is $L(X)$. For $R \in L(X)$ and $Y \subset X$ let $R|Y$ denote the relation $R \cap Y \times Y$ on y, the *restriction* of R to y. A *profile* p is a map from n to $L(X)$, where $p = (p(1), p(2), ..., p(n))$ and we write $x \succ_{p(h)} y$ if individual h strongly prefers x to y at profile p. The set of all profiles is $L(X)^N$. Let $\wp$ be a nonempty subset of $L(X)^N$. For each subset Y of X and each profile p in $\wp$, let $p|Y$ denote the restriction of profile $p \in \wp$ to Y. That is, $p|Y$ represents the function $q \in L(Y)^N$ satisfying $q(i) = p(i)|Y$ for all $i \in N$. A *social choice rule* on $\wp$ is a function $g : \wp \to X$. A rule g is *full-range* if Range$(g) = X$, and g is *dictatorial* if there is an individual i such that $g(p)$ is the highest ranked element in Range(g) according to ordering $p(i)$.

In this paper, we consider social choice rules on the Non-Paretian domain, NP, the set of all profiles p such that for any pair of distinct alternatives, x and y, there exists an individual $i \in N$ such that $x \succ_{p(i)} y$ and there exists an individual $j \in N$ such that $y \succ_{p(j)} x$, so that neither alternative is Pareto-superior to the other.

Two profiles p and q are *h-variants*, where $h \in N$, if $q(i) = p(i)$ for all $i \neq h$. Individual h can *manipulate* the social choice rule $g : \wp \to X$ at p via p' if p and p' belong to $\wp$, p and p' are h-variants, and $g(p') \succ_{p(h)} g(p)$. And g is *strategy-proof* if no one can manipulate g at any profile.

3. The N−Range Theorem: Part 1.

As observed earlier, our focus is on the range of g restricted to special subdomains of NP. We define NP^* to be the subdomain of all profiles u on which individials $n-1$ and n agree: $u(n-1) = u(n)$. The goal is to show

Theorem 3-1. (The N-Range Theorem). If. $m = 3$ and g on NP is of full range, so is $g|NP^*$.

We address the converse: We assume that $g|NP^*$ is of less than full range and use that to show g must be of less than full range on NP. We will actually do this in two parts by establishing

Theorem 3-2. (The N-Range Theorem, Part 1). If $m = 3$ and $g|NP^*$ has range of just two alternatives then g must be of less than full range on NP.in this section and then proving

Theorem 4-1. (The N-Range Theorem, Part 2). If $m = 3$ and $g|NP^*$ has range of just one alternative then g must be of less than full range on NP.in Section 4.

The more detailed strategy for proving Theorem 3-2 starts by determining a very short list L of profiles such that if x is chosen at some profile in NP it will also have to be chosen at a profile in L. Then for each profile u in

L, we exploit a decisiveness structure for $g|NP^*$ to show that x is not chosen at u if x is not chosen in NP^*. Typically, we will assume x is chosen at u and shoow that leads to a manipulability at some profile in NP, a contradiction of strategy-proofness.

Section 3-1. The list of profiles

Lemma 3-3. Suppose Range($g|NP^*$) $= \{y, z\}$. There exists a list L of three profiles (along with other profiles that can be transformed from a member of L by switching y and z everywhere; or switching preferences of $n-1$ and n or switching orderings within the set of individuals $i < n-1$) such that, if $x \in$ Range(g), for strategy-proof g, then $x = g(u)$ for some u in the list L.

Proof of Lemma 3-3: A profile u in the list L will be described in terms of where x appears in the orderings for individuals $n-1$ and n.

Suppose x is at the bottom of both $u(n-1)$ and $u(n)$. Then it is possible to switch y and z for one of the two to get a profile u^* that is not just in NP, but in NP^*, so $g(u^*) \neq x$. But then the switching individual would manipulate from u to u^*, a violation of strategy-proofness.

Similarly, suppose x is at the top of both $u(n-1)$ and $u(n)$. Then it is possible to switch y and z for one of the two to get a profile u^* that is in NP^*, so $g(u^*) \neq x$. But then the switching individual would manipulate from u^* to u, a violation of strategy-proofness. There remain four possibilities:

I. x is at the top for one and at the bottom for the other;

II. x is at the bottom for one and in the middle for the other;

III. x is at the top for one and in the middle for the other;

IV. x is in the middle for both.

Case I. Suppose x is at the top for n and at the bottom for $n-1$ for profile $u0$ where $g(u0) = x$. Then profile $u1$ is constructed from $u0$ by switching y and z for either $n-1$ or n so y and z are ordered by $n-1$ the opposite of their ordering by n. We have $g(u1) = x$ or g is manipulable. Then raise x to the top for each of the $i < n-1$ in turn. The resulting profile $u2$ will have $g(u_2) = x$ or else g is manipulable. Finally change the ordering of y and z for all $i < n-1$ to agree with the ordering of y and z by n. Such a profile looks like

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		z	x
y	y	y	$\cdots$	y	y
z	z	z		x	z

This profile, $L1$, will be in the list L (along with other profiles that can be transformed from this by switching y and z everywhere; or switching preferences of $n-1$ and n, but all of these will be equivalent in that if a strategy-proof rule could have x chosen at one but not on NP^*, then a rule could be designed that had x chosen at any other one but not on NP^*.

Case II. Suppose x is at the bottom for one and in the middle for the other, say

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-1$	n
				y	z
			$\cdots$	x	y
				z	x

Here, if necessary, y and z will be switched for n to be oppositely ordered from how they are ordered by $n-1$. If that's not possible because every $i < n-1$ has y above z, select one of them, say 1, raise x to the top of 1's ordering, switch y and z and then continue. But then x can be raised for $n-1$ and still have x chosen. This puts us back into Case I, so we do not have to add any profiles from Case II to the list L.

Case III. Suppose x is at the top for one and in the middle for the other, say

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-1$	n
				y	x
			$\cdots$	x	z
				z	y

Here, if necessary, y and z will be switched for n to be oppositely ordered from how they are ordered by $n-1$. If any $i < n-1$ has y preferred to x we could raise x in $n-1$'s ordering, stay in NP, and still have x chosen. But this is a case we have already treated. So we may assume every $i < n-1$ prefers x to y. Also to be in NP, at least one of them, say 1, must have z preferred to x:

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-1$	n
z				y	x
x	x	x	$\cdots$	x	z
y	y	y		z	y

Then for every i such that $2 < i < n-1$, we can raise x to the top, and switch y and z if necessary to agree with n, stay in NP and still have x chosen at the following profile:

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		y	x
x	z	z	$\cdots$	x	z
y	y	y		z	y

This profile, $L2$, will also be in list L (along with other profiles that can be transformed from this by switching y and z everywhere; or switching preferences of $n-1$ and n or switching orderings within the set of individuals $i < n-1$).

Case IV. Suppose x is in the middle for both. Since x is chosen we are not in NP^*, and the ordering for $n-1$ must be the inverse of the ordering for n:

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
					y	z
			$\cdots$		x	x
					z	y

If any $i < n-1$ has y preferred to x, we could raise x to the top for $n-1$, still be in NP, and still have x chosen. That would put us in Case III, and we wouldn't have to add anything to list L. Similarly, if any $i < n-1$ has $z \succ x$, we could raise x to the top for n, still be in NP, and still have x chosen. That would also put us in Case III, and we wouldn't have to add anything to list L. So we may assume that x is at the top for every $i < n-1$. Then y and z could be switched for each $i < n-1$ if necessary to be ordered the same as for n:

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	y	z
z	z	z	$\cdots$	z	x	x
y	y	y		y	z	y

This profile, $L3$, will be the third and last in the list L (along with other profiles that can be transformed from this by switching y and z everywhere; or switching preferences of $n-1$ and n). $\square$

Section 3-2. Decisiveness structuresProof of Theorem 3-2. For each of the three profile types in L, we exploit decisiveness structures to show that x is not chosen at that profile.

.

Given strategy-proof rule g on the NP domain for m alternatives and n individuals with Range$(g) = \{y, z\}$, we define a rule g^* on the NP domain for m alternatives and $n-1$ individuals. At profile $u = (u_1, u_2, ..., u_{n-1})$, we set$g^*(u) = g(u_1, u_2, ..., u_{n-1}, u_n)$, where $u_n = u_{n-1}$. so g is operating on a profile in NP^*. We have observed earlier (Campbell and Kelly, 2014b) that g^* is strategy-proof; it clearly has range $\{y, z\}$. A result of Barberá et al (2010) can be modified to show that for g^* there is a collection of coalitions decisive for y against z and a related collection of coalitions decisive for z against y, each collection satisfying a monotonicity condition: supersets of members are also members.

Correspondingly, then, we know a decisiveness structure for $g|NP^*$. Let C be a coalition in $\{1, 2, ..., n-2\}$.

1. If C is decisive for g^* for y against z (z against y), then C is decisive for $g|NP^*$ for y against z (z against y).

2. If C is minimally decisive for g^* for y against z (z against y), then C is minimally decisive for $g|NP^*$ for y against z (z against y).

3. If $C \cup \{n-1\}$ is decisive for g^* for y against z (z against y), then $C \cup \{n-1, n\}$ is decisive for $g|NP^*$ for y against z (z against y).

4. If $C \cup \{n-1\}$ is minimally decisive for g^* for y against z (z against y), there is no proper subset C^* of C such that $C^* \cup \{n-1, n\}$ is

decisive for $g|NP^*$ for y against z (z against y). With some license, we will say $C \cup \{n-1, n\}$ is minimally decisive for $g|NP^*$.

There are two possible categories of decisiveness structures for g^*. In the first category, some minimal decisive coalition for y against z for g^* is contained in $\{1, ..., n-2\}$. (Or, alternatively, some minimum decisive coalition for z against y for g is contained in $\{1, ..., n-2\}$.) Within this first category, there are two possibilities to consider:

Case A. Some subset S of $\{1, ..., n-2\}$, containing at least two elements, is a minimal decisive coalition for y against z (alternatively, some subset of $\{1, ..., n-2\}$, containing at least two elements, is a minimal decisive coalition for z against y). Since N contains more than two individuals, we then automatically have useful coalitions decisive (though possibly not minimally) for z against y, namely $X \backslash S$ together with a non−empty proper subset of S.

Case B. Some singleton subset S of $\{1, ..., n-2\}$ is a minimal decisive coalition for y against z. When S is a singleton, we sometimes must think carefully about coalitions decisive for z against y (of course, since $Range(g^*) = \{y, z\}$, some such coalitions exist).

In the second category, every minimal decisive coalition for y against z for g^* includes $n-1$. The possibilities are that either $\{n-1\}$ itself is a minimal decisive coalition for y against z or that every minimal decisive coalition for y against z includes both $n-1$ and some individual in $\{1, ..., n-2\}$. But in the latter case, some subset of $\{1, ..., n-2\}$ is a minimal decisive coalition for z against y and we are back in Case A or Case B. So we only need to treat the following possibility:

Case C. $\{n-1\}$ is a minimal decisive coalition for y against z for g^* and $\{n-1\}$ is also a minimal decisive coalition for z against y for g^*. So $\{n-1, n\}$ is a decisive coalition for y against z and for z against y for $g|NP^*$.

Accordingly, with three profiles in L to treat and, for each of those profiles, three kinds of decisiveness structures to consider, we complete the proof by carrying nine tasks.

Section 3-3. $L1$.

We want to show that for any collection of decisive coalitions, $x \notin Range(g|NP^*)$ and strategy-proofness of g will exclude the possibility that x is chosen at profile $L1$:

$L1$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	z	x
y	y	y	$\cdots$	y	y	y
z	z	z		z	x	z

(All profiles displayed in this paper are elements of NP; this is easily checked and will not be further remarked upon.)

Case $L1$.A. Some subset S of $\{1, ..., n-2\}$, containing at least two elements, is a minimal decisive coalition for y against z (alternatively, some subset of $\{1, ..., n-2\}$, containing at least two elements, is a minimal decisive coalition for z against y). We treat here the case where $\{1, 2, .., k\}$ is a *minimal* decisive set for y against z (the case for a subset of $\{1, ..., n-2\}$ being decisive for z against y can be dealt with similarly). Note that $k = n-2$ is allowed.

We want to show that for minimal decisive coalition $\{1, 2, .., k\}$, a violation of strategy-proofness of g will follow from an assumption that x is chosen at profile $L1$:

$L1$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$k-1$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	x	x		x	z	x
y	y	y	$\cdots$	y	y	y	$\cdots$	y	y	y
z	z	z		z	z	z		z	x	z

Alternative x is chosen at $L1$ if and only if x is chosen at $L1^*$:

$L1^*$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$k-1$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	x	x		x	z	x
y	y	y	$\cdots$	y	y	z	$\cdots$	z	y	y
z	z	z		z	z	y		y	x	z

with y and z reversed below x for $\{k+1, ..., n-2\}$.

At n-variant $u1$ in NP^*:

$u1$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$k-1$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	x	x		x	z	z
y	y	y	$\cdots$	y	y	z	$\cdots$	z	y	y
z	z	z		z	z	y		y	x	x

$g(u1) = y$ by decisiveness of $\{1, ..., k\}$ for y against z and then at 2-variant profile $u2$, also in NP^*:

$u2$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$k-1$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	x	x		x	z	z
y	z	y	$\cdots$	y	y	z	$\cdots$	z	y	y
z	y	z		z	z	y		y	x	x

$g(u2) = z$ since $\{1, ..., k\}$ is a minimal decisive set for y against z on NP^*. Next, at n-variant profile $u3$:

$u3$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$k-1$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	x	x		x	z	z
y	z	y	$\cdots$	y	y	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
z	y	z		z	z	y		y	x	y

$g(u3) = z$ or n manipulates from $u3$ to $u2$. Next consider 2-variant profile $u4$:

$u4$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$k-1$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	x	x		x	z	z
y	y	y	$\cdots$	y	y	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
z	z	z		z	z	y		y	x	y

$g(u4) \neq z$ or n manipulates from $u1$ to $u4$. And $g(u4) \neq x$ or 2 manipulates from $u3$ to $u4$. So $g(u4) = y$. But then, if $g(L1^*) = x$, voter n would manipulate from $u4$ to $L1^*$:

$L1^*$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$k-1$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	x	x		x	z	x
y	y	y	$\cdots$	y	y	z	$\cdots$	z	y	y
z	z	z		z	z	y		y	x	z

Subcase $L1$.B. Without loss of generality, $\{1\}$ is a (minimal) decisive coalition for y against z for $g|NP^*$. There are many possible coalitions C decisive for z against y. These must include 1, but won't have to be minimal, so we choose them as large as possible (though they still have to exclude at least one individual) since a small coalitions being decisive implies supersets also decisive. We distinguish between two possibilities, regarding which kind of individual is excluded:

1. The individual excluded for is in $\{1, ..., n-2\}$, say $n-2$, so $\{1, ..., n-3, n-1, n\}$ is decisive for z against y for $g|NP^*$.

2. The individual excluded for is $n-1$, so $\{1, ..., n-2\}$ is decisive for z against y for $g|NP^*$. If the minimal decisive coalition for z against y in $\{1, ..., n-2\}$ contains an individual in addition to 1, we are in the situation already covered in Case A. So we may assume that $\{1\}$ is decisive for z against y as well as for y against z in NP^*. But then also $\{1, ..., n-3, n-1, n\}$ is decisive for z against y for $g|NP^*$, and we are back to the first possibility.

So we only need to treat the case where coalition $\{1\}$ is decisive for y against z on NP^* and $\{1, ..., n-3, n-1, n\}$ is decisive for z against y on NP^*. At $L1$, x is chosen by assumption:

$L1$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-3$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	x	z	x
y	y	y	$\cdots$	y	y	y	y
z	z	z		z	z	x	z

Then x must also be chosen at $L1^*$:

$L1^*$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-3$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	x	z	x
y	z	z	$\cdots$	z	y	y	y
z	y	y		y	z	x	z

obtained by switching y and z for individuals $2, ..., n-3$.

At n-variant $u1$:

$u1$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-3$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	x	z	z
y	z	z	$\cdots$	z	y	y	x
z	y	y		y	z	x	y

$g(u1) \neq y$ or n will manipulate to $L1^*$. Next consider $u2$, another n-variant of $u1$, but one that is in NP^*:

$u2$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-3$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	x	z	z
y	z	z	$\cdots$	z	y	y	y
z	y	y		y	z	x	x

$g(u2) = y$, since $\{1\}$ is decisive for y against z on NP^*. Then $g(u1) \neq z$ or n will manipulate from $u2$ to $u1$. Combining, $g(u1) = x$.

Now look at profile $u3$, also in NP^*:

$u3$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-3$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	x	z	z
z	z	z	$\cdots$	z	y	y	y
y	y	y		y	z	x	x

$g(u3) = z$ by the decisiveness of $\{1, 2, ..., n-3, n-1, n\}$ for z against y on NP^*. Then at n-variant profile $u4$:

$u4$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-3$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	x	z	z
z	z	z	$\cdots$	z	y	y	x
y	y	y		y	z	x	y

$g(u4) = z$ or n will manipulate from $u4$ to $u3$. But $u4$ is a 1-variant of $u1$ and 1 will manipulate from $u4$ to $u1$.

Case $L1$.C: In this case $\{n-1\}$ is decisive for y against z and also for z against y for rule g^*, i.e., $\{n-1, n\}$ is decisive both ways for rule $g|NP^*$. We first trace out two results of decisiveness and strategy-proofness.

Result #1

We assume x is chosen at $L1$:

$L1$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	z	x
y	y	y	$\cdots$	y	y	y
z	z	z		z	x	z

and seek a contradiction. We must have $g(u1) = x$ at 1-variant $u1$:

$u1$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	z	x
z	y	y	$\cdots$	y	y	y
y	z	z		z	x	z

or 1 manipulates from $u1$ to $L1$. Then $g(u2) = x$ at $(n-1)$-variant $u2$:

$u2$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	y	x
z	y	y	$\cdots$	y	z	y
y	z	z		z	x	z

or $n-1$ manipulates from $u1$ to $u2$. Now $g(u3) \neq y$ at 1-variant $u3$:

$u3$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	y	x
x	y	y	$\cdots$	y	z	y
y	z	z		z	x	z

or 1 manipulates from $u3$ to $u2$. We next show $g(u3) \neq z$.

At $u4$ in NP^*:

$u4$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	x	x
y	y	y	$\cdots$	y	y	y
x	z	z		z	z	z

$g(u4) = y$ by the decisiveness of $\{n-1, n\}$ on NP^*. That implies $g(u5) = y$ at $(n-1)$-variant profile $u5$:

$u5$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	y	x
y	y	y	$\cdots$	y	z	y
x	z	z		z	x	z

or $n-1$ manipulates from $u5$ to $u4$. But $u5$ is a 1-variant of $u3$:

$u3$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	y	x
x	y	y	$\cdots$	y	z	y
y	z	z		z	x	z

So, if $g(u3) = z$, 1 would manipulate from $u5$ to $u3$. Therefore $g(u3) \neq z$. Combining, $g(u3) = x$.

Result #2

Earlier we saw that if x is selected at $L1$ then $g(u2) = x$ at $u2$:

$u2$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	y	x
z	y	y	$\cdots$	y	z	y
y	z	z		z	x	z

Then $g(u6) = x$ at n-variant $u6$:

$u6$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	y	x
z	y	y	$\cdots$	y	z	z
y	z	z		z	x	y

or n manipulates from $u6$ to $u2$. Therefore $g(u7) \neq y$ at 1-variant $u7$:

$u7$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	y	x
x	y	y	$\cdots$	y	z	z
y	z	z		z	x	y

or 1 manipulates from $u7$ to $u6$. We next show $g(u7) \neq x$.

At $u8$ in NP^*

$u8$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	x		x	x	x
x	x	y	$\cdots$	y	z	z
y	z	z		z	y	y

$g(u8) = z$ by the decisiveness of $\{n-1, n\}$ on NP^*. Then $g(u9) = z$ at $(n-1)$-variant $u9$:

$u9$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	x		x	z	x
x	x	y	$\cdots$	y	y	z
y	z	z		z	x	y

or $n-1$ manipulates from $u9$ to $u8$. Then $g(u10) = z$ at 2-variant $u10$:

$u10$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	z	x
x	y	y	$\cdots$	y	y	z
y	z	z		z	x	y

or 2 manipulates from $u9$ to $u10$. But $u10$ is an $(n-1)$-variant of $u7$:

$u7$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	y	x
x	y	y	$\cdots$	y	z	z
y	z	z		z	x	y

If $g(u7) = x$, then $n-1$ manipulates from $u7$ to $u10$. Therefore, $g(u7) \neq x$. Combining, $g(u7) = z$.

Main Thread

By Result #1, x is chosen at $u3$:

$u3$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	y	x
x	y	y	$\cdots$	y	z	y
y	z	z		z	x	z

and by Result #2, z is chosen at $u7$:

$u7$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	y	x
x	y	y	$\cdots$	y	z	z
y	z	z		z	x	y

Then n manipulates from $u7$ to $u3$ and g violates strategy-proofness. This establishes that x is not selected at $L1$ if x is not in the range of $g|NP^*$.

Section 3-4. $L2$.
We assume that x is chosen at $L2$:

$L2$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	z	x	x		x	y	x
	x	z	z	$\cdots$	z	x	z
	y	y	y		y	z	y

and seek a contradiction to strategy-proofness of g. This is more complicated than the analysis for $L1$ or $L3$ since $L2(1)$ is different from $L2(2)$, ..., and $L2(n-2)$ whereas for $L1$ and $L3$ all of the first $n-2$ individuals have the same ordering.

We first explain the organization of the proof, laying out a set of cases to be considered, and then later fill in an analysis of each case and subcase.

Case $L2$.A: A subset S of $\{1, 2, ..., n-2\}$ is a minimal decisive set for y against z for g^* and so also for $g|NP^*$ and the smallest such minimal subset has at least two individuals. Because L2(1) is different, we must now distinguish between two subcases according to whether or not S contains 1.

Subcase $L2$.A.1: A subset S of $\{2, ..., n-2\}$, say $S = \{2, ..., k\}$ for $3 \leq k \leq n-2$ of at least two individuals is a minimal decisive set for y against z for $g|NP^*$, i.e., S does not contain 1. This requires $n \geq 5$.

We also need to consider possible coalitions T decisive for z against y for $g|NP^*$. Since $\{1\}$ is not decisive for y against z for g^*, we see $\{2, 3, ..., n-1, n\}$ is decisive for z against y for $g|NP^*$.

Subcase $L2$.A.2: A subset $S = \{1, ..., k\}$ for $2 \leq k \leq n-2$ is a minimal decisive set for y against z for g^* and so also for $g|NP^*$, i.e., S does contain 1 and 2). Within this subcase we must again consider possibilities regarding coalitions T decisive for z against y for g. But we know some coalitions decisive for z against y due to the minimality of S: For example, $\{2, k+1, ..., n-1\}$ is decisive for z against y for g^* and so $\{2, 3, ..., n\}$ is decisive for z against y for $g|NP^*$.

Case $L2$.B: A singleton from $\{1, 2, ..., n-2\}$ is a minimal decisive set for $g|NP^*$. We again distinguish two subcases.

Subcase $L2$B.1: $\{1\}$ is a minimal decisive set for y against z for $g|NP^*$.

We also need to consider possible coalitions T decisive for z against y for $g|NP^*$.

Possibility a. 2 is excluded and {1,3,..., n-1} is decisive for z against y for g^* and so $\{1, 3, ..., n\}$ is decisive for z against y for $g|NP^*$.

Possibility b. $n-1$ is excluded and $\{1, 2, ..., n-2\}$ is decisive for z against y for for g^* and so also for $g|NP^*$.

Subcase $L2$B.2: A singleton from $\{2, ..., n-2\}$, say $\{2\}$, is a minimal decisive set for y against z for $g|NP^*$.

We also need to consider possible coalitions T decisive for z against y for $g|NP^*$. Alternative 2 must also be in T; and some element can be excluded from T since we can't have Pareto domination.

Possibility a. 1 is excluded and $\{2, ..., n\}$ is decisive for z against y for $g|NP^*$.

Possibility b. An individual in $\{3, ..., n-2\}$, say 3, is excluded and $\{1, 3, ..., n\}$ is decisive for z against y for g on $g|NP^*$.

Possibility c. $n-1$ is excluded and $\{1, 2, ..., n-2\}$ is decisive for z against y for $g|NP^*$.

Case $L2$.C: The coalition $\{n-1, n\}$ is a (minimal) decisive set for z against y for $g|NP^*$.

Now we analyze each subcase in turn.

Subcase $L2$.A.1: $\{2, ..., k\}$ is decisive for y against z and $\{2, ..., n\}$ is decisive for z against y for $g|NP^*$.

Result 1

At profile $u1$:

$u1$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	x		x	z	z
x	y	y	$\cdots$	y	z	$\cdots$	z	y	y
y	z	z		z	y		y	x	x

we have $g(u1) = y$ since $\{2, ..., k\}$ is decisive for y against z for $g|NP^*$. Then at $(n-1)$-variant profile $u2$:

$u2$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	x		x	y	z
x	y	y	$\cdots$	y	z	$\cdots$	z	z	y
y	z	z		z	y		y	x	x

y is also chosen or else $n-1$ will manipulate from $u2$ to $u1$. Next, at n-variant profile $u3$,

$u3$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	x		x	y	x
x	y	y	$\cdots$	y	z	$\cdots$	z	z	z
y	z	z		z	y		y	x	y

we have $g(u3) \neq z$ or n would manipulate from $u2$ to $u3$. Similarly, at n-variant $u4$,

$u4$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	x		x	y	x
x	y	y	$\cdots$	y	z	$\cdots$	z	z	y
y	z	z		z	y		y	x	z

We have $g(u4) \neq z$ or n would manipulate from $u2$ to $u4$.

Result 2

We are assuming x is chosen at $L2$:

$L2$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	x		x	y	x
x	z	z	$\cdots$	z	z	$\cdots$	z	x	z
y	y	y		y	y		y	z	y

Then x is also chosen at $L2^*$:

$L2^*$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	x		x	y	x
x	y	y	$\cdots$	y	z	$\cdots$	z	x	z
y	z	z		z	y		y	z	y

obtained by interchanging y and z below x for individuals $2, ..., k$. In turn, this implies that at $(n-1)$-variant profile $u3$, we get $g(u3) \neq y$ or $n-1$ manipulates from $L2^*$ to $u3$. Then $g(u3) = x$.

Result 3

From earlier analysis, we know x is not chosen at $L1$:

$L1$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	x		x	z	x
y	y	y	$\cdots$	y	y	$\cdots$	y	y	y
z	z	z		z	z		z	x	z

Then x is also not chosen at profile $L1^*$, obtained from $L1$ by interchanging y and z below x for individuals $t+1, ..., n-2$:

$L1^*$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	x		x	z	x
y	y	y	$\cdots$	y	z	$\cdots$	z	y	y
z	z	z		z	y		y	x	z

So also x is not chosen at 1-variant profile $u5$:

$u5$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	x		x	z	x
x	y	y	$\cdots$	y	z	$\cdots$	z	y	y
y	z	z		z	y		y	x	z

or 1 would manipulate from $L1^*$ to $u5$. Then $g(u4) \neq x$ or $n-1$ manipulates from $u4$ to $u5$.

Main Thread

By Result 1 and Result 2, x is chosen at $u3$:

$u3$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	x		x	y	x
x	y	y	$\cdots$	y	z	$\cdots$	z	z	z
y	z	z		z	y		y	x	y

By Result 1 and Result 3, y is chosen at $u4$:

$u4$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	z	x	x		x	x		x	y	x
	x	y	y	$\cdots$	y	z	$\cdots$	z	z	y
	y	z	z		z	y		y	x	z

But then n manipulates from $u4$ to $u3$, and g violates strategy-proofness.

Subcase $L2$A.2: A subset $S = \{1, ..., k\}$ for $2 \leq k \leq n-2$ is a minimal decisive set for y against z for $g|NP^*$, i.e., S does contain 1 and 2). Within this subcase we must again consider possibilities regarding coalitions T decisive for z against y for $g|NP^*$. But we know some coalitions decisive for z against y due to the minimality of S: For example, $\{2, k+1, ..., n-1\}$ is decisive for z against y for $g|NP^*$.

Result 1.

At $L1$:

$L1$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	x	x	x		x	x		x	z	x
	y	y	y	$\cdots$	y	y	$\cdots$	y	y	y
	z	z	z		z	z		z	x	z

we have $g(L1) \neq x$ by our previous analysis. Then x is also not chosen at $L1^*$, obtained by reversing y and z below x for $k+1, ..., n-2$ or else a standard sequence argument will show a violation of strategy-proofness.

$L1^*$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	x	x	x		x	x		x	z	x
	y	y	y	$\cdots$	y	z	$\cdots$	z	y	y
	z	z	z		z	y		y	x	z

Then at 1-variant profile $u1$:

$u1$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	z	x	x		x	x		x	z	x
	x	y	y	$\cdots$	y	z	$\cdots$	z	y	y
	y	z	z		z	y		y	x	z

we have $g(u1) \neq x$ or 1 manipulates from $L1^*$ to $u1$. Then at $(n-1)$-variant $u2$:

$u2$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	z	x	x		x	x		x	y	x
	x	y	y	$\cdots$	y	z	$\cdots$	z	z	y
	y	z	z		z	y		y	x	z

we have $g(u2) \neq x$ or $n-1$ manipulates from $u2$ to $u1$.

Next, at n-variant $u3$:

$u3$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	z	x	x		x	x		x	y	x
	x	y	y	$\cdots$	y	z	$\cdots$	z	z	z
	y	z	z		z	y		y	x	y

we get $g(u3) \neq x$ or n manipulates from $u2$ to $u3$.

Result 2.

We are assuming x is chosen at profile $L2$:

$L2$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	z	x	x		x	x		x	y	x
	x	z	z	$\cdots$	z	z	$\cdots$	z	x	z
	y	y	y		y	y		y	z	y

Then at profile $u4$, obtained by interchanging y and z below x for 2 to k:

$u4$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	z	x	x		x	x		x	y	x
	x	y	y	$\cdots$	y	z	$\cdots$	z	x	z
	y	z	z		z	y		y	z	y

$g(u4) = x$ by strategy-proofness.

Profile $u4$ is also an $(n-1)$-variant of $u3$, and $g(u4) = x$ implies $g(u3) \neq y$ or $n-1$ manipulates from $u4$ to $u3$. Hence $g(u3) = z$.

Result 3.

At profile $u5$:

$u5$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	z	x	x		x	x		x	x	x
	y	y	y	$\cdots$	y	z	$\cdots$	z	z	z
	x	z	z		z	y		y	y	y

$g(u5) = z$ since $\{1, ..., k\}$ is minimal decisive for y against z on NP^*. Then at $(n-1)$-variant profile $u6$:

$u6$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	z	x	x		x	x		x	y	x
	y	y	y	$\cdots$	y	z	$\cdots$	z	x	z
	x	z	z		z	y		y	z	y

we have $g(u6) \neq x$ or $n-1$ manipulates from $u5$ to $u6$. Profile $u6$ is also a 1-variant of $u4$ and so $g(u6) \neq z$ or 1 manipulates from $u4$ to $u6$. Summarizing, $g(u6) = y$.

Main Thread

At profile $u7$, an $(n-1)$-variant of $u6$:

$u7$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	x		x	y	x
y	y	y	$\cdots$	y	z	$\cdots$	z	z	z
x	z	z		z	y		y	x	y

$g(u7) = y$ or $n-1$ manipulates from $u7$ to $u6$. But $u7$ is also a 1 variant of $u3$:

$u3$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	x		x	y	x
x	y	y	$\cdots$	y	z	$\cdots$	z	z	z
y	z	z		z	y		y	x	y

and $g(u3) = z$ from Result 1 combined with Result 2. Therefore 1 manipulates from $u7$ to $u3$, and g violates strategy-proofness.

Case $L2$.B: A singleton from $\{1, 2, ..., n-2\}$ is a minimal decisive set for y against z for $g|NP^*$. We again distinguish two subcases.

Subcase $L2$B.1: $\{1\}$ is a minimal decisive set for y against z for $g|NP^*$.

We also need to consider possible coalitions T decisive for z against y for $g|NP^*$.

Possibility a. 2 is excluded and $\{1, 3, ..., n\}$ is decisive for z against y for $g|NP^*$.

Result 1.

At profile $L2$,

$L2$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	y	x
x	z	z	$\cdots$	z	x	z
y	y	y		y	z	y

we get $g(L2) = x$ by assumption. Then at 2-variant $u1$,

$u1$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	y	x
x	y	z	$\cdots$	z	x	z
y	z	y		y	z	y

we have $g(u1) = x$ or 2 manipulates from $u1$ to $L2$. Then at $(n-1)$-variant profile $u2$:

$u2$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	y	x
x	y	z	$\cdots$	z	z	z
y	z	y		y	x	y

we get $g(u2) \neq y$ or $n-1$ manipulates from $u1$ to $u2$. At n-variant profile $u3$,

$u3$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	y	z
x	y	z	$\cdots$	z	z	x
y	z	y		y	x	y

we have $g(u3) \neq y$ or n manipulates from $u3$ to $u2$.

Result 2.

At profile $L1$,

$L1$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	z	x
y	y	y	$\cdots$	y	y	y
z	z	z		z	x	z

we get $g(L1) \neq x$ by an earlier analysis. Then x is also not chosen at $L1^*$, obtained by switching y and z below x for individuals 3, ..., $n-2$:

$L1^*$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	z	x
y	y	z	$\cdots$	z	y	y
z	z	y		y	x	z

Then at 1-variant profile $u4$:

$u4$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	z	x
x	y	z	$\cdots$	z	y	y
y	z	y		y	x	z

we also have x not chosen or 1 manipulates from $L1^*$ to $u4$. Next, at $(n-1)$-variant profile $u5$:

$u5$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	y	x
x	y	z	$\cdots$	z	z	y
y	z	y		y	x	z

we have $g(u5) \neq x$ or $n-1$ manipulates from $u5$ to $u4$. Then $g(u3) \neq x$ or n manipulates from $u5$ to $u3$. Hence $g(u3) = z$

Result 3.

At profile $L2$:

$L2$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	y	x
x	z	z	$\cdots$	z	x	z
y	y	y		y	z	y

we have $g(L2) = x$ by assumption. Then at 2-variant profile $u6$:

$u6$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	x		x	y	x
x	x	z	$\cdots$	z	x	z
y	z	y		y	z	y

$g(u6) \neq z$ or 2 manipulates from $u6$ to $L2$.

Result 4.

$u7$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	z	y	x		x	x	x
	x	x	z	$\cdots$	z	z	z
	y	z	y		y	y	y

$g(u7) = z$ since $\{1, 3, ..., n\}$ is decisive for z against y on NP^*. If $g(u6) = x$, then $n-1$ would manipulate from $u7$ to $u6$. Therefore, $g(u6) \neq x$. Hence $g(u6) = y$.

Main Thread

By Result 3 and Result 4, y is chosen at $u6$:

$u6$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	z	y	x		x	y	x
	x	x	z	$\cdots$	z	x	z
	y	z	y		y	z	y

So y is also chosen at $(n-1)$-variant $u8$:

$u8$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	z	y	x		x	y	x
	x	x	z	$\cdots$	z	z	z
	y	z	y		y	x	y

or $n-1$ will manipulate from $u8$ to $u6$. Then again, y is chosen at n-variant profile $u9$:

$u9$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	z	y	x		x	y	z
	x	x	z	$\cdots$	z	z	x
	y	z	y		y	x	y

or n manipulates from $u8$ to $u9$.

But by Result 1 and Result 2, z is chosen at $u3$:

$u3$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	z	x	x		x	y	z
	x	y	z	$\cdots$	z	z	x
	y	z	y		y	x	y

So 2 would manipulate from $u3$ to $u9$, showing that g violates strategy-proofness.

Possibility b. $n-1$ is excluded and $\{1, 2, ..., n-2\}$ is decisive for z against y for g and so $\{1, 2, ..., n-2\}$ is decisive for z against y for g on NP^*.

This is covered by $L2$.A, except when T is the singleton $\{1\}$, so here we assume $\{1\}$ is decisive for y against z and also z against y on NP^*.

We are assuming x is chosen at $L2$:

$L2$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	y	x
x	z	z	$\cdots$	z	x	z
y	y	y		y	z	y

So at profile $u1$, where y and z are interchanged below x for $2, ..., n-2$, strategy-proofness implies x is still chosen:

$u1$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	y	x
x	y	y	$\cdots$	y	x	z
y	z	z		z	z	y

This implies that at 1-variant profile $u2$:

$u2$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	y	x
y	y	y	$\cdots$	y	x	z
x	z	z		z	z	y

$g(u2) \neq z$ or 1 will manipulate from $u1$ to $u2$.

Now $u2$ is also an $(n-1)$-variant of $u3$:

$u3$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	x	x
y	y	y	$\cdots$	y	y	z
x	z	z		z	z	y

If $g(u3) = z$, $n-1$ will manipulate from $u3$ to $u2$. So $g(u3) \neq z$.

But then consider n variant profile $u4$:

$u4$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	x	x
y	y	y	$\cdots$	y	y	y
x	z	z		z	z	z

where $g(u4) = z$ since $\{1\}$ is decisive for z against y on NP^*. But then n manipulates from $u4$ to $u3$ showing that g violates strategy-proofness.

Subcase $L2$B.2: A singleton from $\{2, ..., n-2\}$, say $\{2\}$, is a minimal decisive set for y against z for $g|NP^*$. This is covered by Case $L2$.A since we did not have to assume that T had more than two members. Since that proof made no use of coalitions decisive for z against y, we also don't need to treat such issues here.

Case $L2$.C: This time we assume $\{n-1, n\}$ is a decisive coalition both ways for $g|NP^*$. We first establish two intermediate results.

Result 1

At profile $u1$ in NP^*:

$u1$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	x	x
y	y	y	$\cdots$	y	z	z
x	z	z		z	y	y

we have $g(u1) = z$ by the decisiveness of $\{n-1, n\}$ on NP^*. Therefore, $g(u2) \neq x$ at $(n-1)$-variant profile $u2$:

$u2$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	y	x
y	y	y	$\cdots$	y	x	z
x	z	z		z	z	y

or $n-1$ manipulates from $u1$ to $u2$. We next show $g(u2) \neq z$.

We are assuming x is chosen at $L2$:

$L2$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	y	x
x	z	z	$\cdots$	z	x	z
y	y	y		y	z	y

Clearly a sequence of switches of y and z for individuals $2, ..., n-2$ will leave x still chosen at profile $u3$:

$u3$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	y	x
x	y	y	$\cdots$	y	x	z
y	z	z		z	z	y

But then, if $g(u2) = z$, 1 would manipulate from $u3$ to $u2$. So $g(u2) \neq z$. Combining, $g(u2) = y$. This, in turn, implies $g(u4) = y$ at $u4$:

$u4$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	y	x
y	y	y	$\cdots$	y	z	z
x	z	z		z	x	y

or $n-1$ manipulates from $u4$ to $u2$.

Result 2

From earlier analysis, we know x is not chosen at $L1$:

$L1$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	z	x
y	y	y	$\cdots$	y	y	y
z	z	z		z	x	z

But then at $u5$:

$u5$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	z	x
x	y	y	$\cdots$	y	y	y
y	z	z		z	x	z

$g(u5) \neq x$ or 1 manipulates from $L1$ to $u5$. But then at $(n-1)$-variant profile $u6$:

$u6$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	y	x
x	y	y	$\cdots$	y	z	y
y	z	z		z	x	z

$g(u6) \neq x$ or $n-1$ would manipulate from $u6$ to $u5$. But then consider n-variant $u7$:

$u7$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	y	x
x	y	y	$\cdots$	y	z	z
y	z	z		z	x	y

$g(u7) \neq x$ or n would manipulate from $u6$ to $u7$. Note that $u7$ is also an $(n-1)$-variant of $u3$ where $g(u3) = x$. If $g(u7) = y$, then $n-1$ would manipulate from $u3$ to $u7$. Therefore, $g(u7) \neq y$. Combining, $g(u7) = z$.

Main Thread

From Result 1, y is chosen at $u4$:

$u4$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	y	x
y	y	y	$\cdots$	y	z	z
x	z	z		z	x	y

and from Result 2, z is chosen at $u7$:

$u7$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	y	x
x	y	y	$\cdots$	y	z	z
y	z	z		z	x	y

Then 1 manipulates from $u4$ to $u7$, and g violates strategy-proofness.

Summarizing, we have established that x is not selected at $L2$ or $L1$ if the range of $g|NP^*$ is $\{y, z\}$.

Section 5. $L3$.

Case $L3$.A:

In this Case, we assume $\{1, ..., k\}$ with $1 < k \leq n-2$, is a minimal set decisive for y against z. We want to show x is not chosen at $L3$. Assume to the contrary that $g(L3) = x$.

$L3$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$k-1$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	x	x		x	y	z
z	z	z	$\cdots$	z	z	z	$\cdots$	z	x	x
y	y	y		y	y	y		y	z	y

But x is chosen at $L3$ if and only if x is chosen at $L3$*:

$L3^*$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$k-1$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	x	x		x	y	z
z	z	y	$\cdots$	y	y	z	$\cdots$	z	x	x
y	y	z		z	z	y		y	z	y

with y and z switched for individuals 3 to k. Next observe that at profile $u1$ in NP^*:

$u1$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$k-1$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	x	x		x	z	z
y	z	y	$\cdots$	y	y	z	$\cdots$	z	y	y
z	y	z		z	z	y		y	x	x

we have $g(u1) = z$ since $\{1, ..., k\}$ is *minimal* decisive for y against z on NP^*. Therefore at n-variant $u2$:

$u2$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$k-1$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	x	x		x	z	z
y	z	y	$\cdots$	y	y	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
z	y	z		z	z	y		y	x	y

we also have $g(u2) = z$ or n would manipulate from $u2$ to $u1$.

At profile $u3$ in NP^*:

$u3$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$k-1$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	y	x		x	x	x		x	z	z
y	x	y	$\cdots$	y	y	z	$\cdots$	z	x	x
z	z	z		z	z	y		y	y	y

we get $g(u3) = y$ since $\{1, ..., k\}$ is decisive for y against z on NP^*. Therefore at $(n-1)$-variant $u4$:

$u4$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$k-1$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	y	x		x	x	x		x	z	z
y	x	y	$\cdots$	y	y	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
z	z	z		z	z	y		y	x	y

we also get $g(u4) = y$ or $n-1$ manipulates from $u3$ to $u4$.

Proceeding, at $u5$, a 2-variant of both $u2$ and $u4$:

$u5$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$k-1$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	x	x		x	z	z
y	y	y	$\cdots$	y	y	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
z	z	z		z	z	y		y	x	y

we have $g(u5) \neq x$ or 2 manipulates from $u2$ to $u5$ and $g(u5) \neq z$ or 2 manipulates from $u5$ to $u4$. Therefore $g(u5) = y$. But then at $(n-1)$-variant $u6$:

$u6$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$k-1$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	x	x		x	y	z
y	y	y	$\cdots$	y	y	z	$\cdots$	z	x	x
z	z	z		z	z	y		y	z	y

we get $g(u6) = y$ or $n-1$ manipulates from $u6$ to $u5$. That in turn implies $g(u7) \neq x$ at 2-variant $u7$:

$u7$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$k-1$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	x	x		x	y	z
y	z	y	$\cdots$	y	y	z	$\cdots$	z	x	x
z	y	z		z	z	y		y	z	y

or 2 manipulates from $u6$ to $u7$. And then $g(L3^*) \neq x$ or 1 manipulates from $u7$ to $L3^*$:

$L3^*$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$k-1$	k	$k+1$	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	x	x		x	y	z
z	z	y	$\cdots$	y	y	z	$\cdots$	z	x	x
y	y	z		z	z	y		y	z	y

Case $L3$.B. The analysis here parallels that for $L1$.B: $\{1\}$ is a (minimal) decisive coalition for y against z for $g|NP^*$. There are many possible coalitions C decisive for z against y. These must include 1, but won't have to be minimal, so we choose them as large as possible (though they still have to exclude at least one individual) since a small coalition being decisive implies supersets also decisive. We distinguish between two possibilities:

1. The individual excluded for g^* is in $\{1, ..., n-2\}$, say $n-2$, so $\{1, ..., n-3, n-1, n\}$ is decisive for z against y for $g|NP^*$.

2. The individual excluded for g^* is $n-1$, so $\{1, ..., n-2\}$ is decisive for z against y for $g|NP^*$. If the minimal decisive coalition for z against y in $\{1, ..., n-2\}$ contains an alternative other than 1, we are in the situation already covered in Case A. So we may assume that $\{1\}$ is decisive for z against y as well as for y against z for $g|NP^*$. But then also $\{1, ..., n-3, n-1, n\}$ is decisive for z against y for $g|NP^*$, and we are back to the first possibility.

So we only need to treat the case where coalition $\{1\}$ is decisive for y against z for $g|NP^*$ and $\{1, ..., n-3, n-1, n\}$ is decisive for z against y for $g|NP^*$.

Result 1.

At profile $L3$,

$L3$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-3$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	x	y	z
z	z	z	$\cdots$	z	z	x	x
y	y	y		y	y	z	y

we have by assumption, $g(L3) = x$. Then at 1-variant profile $u1$:

$u1$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-3$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	x	y	z
y	z	z	$\cdots$	z	z	x	x
z	y	y		y	y	z	y

we also have $g(u1) = x$ or 1 manipulates from $u1$ to $L3$. Then at 2-variant profile $u2$:

$u2$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-3$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	x	y	z
y	y	z	$\cdots$	z	z	x	x
z	z	y		y	y	z	y

we also have $g(u2) = x$ or 2 manipulates from $u2$ to $u1$. Then consider $(n-1)$-variant profile $u3$:

$u3$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-3$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	x	z	z
y	y	z	$\cdots$	z	z	y	x
z	z	y		y	y	x	y

We must have $g(u3) \neq y$ or $n-1$ would manipulate from $u2$ to $u3$.

Result 2.

At profile $u4$, an n-variant of $u3$:

$u4$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-3$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	x	z	z
y	y	z	$\cdots$	z	z	y	y
z	z	y		y	y	x	x

$g(u4) = y$ since $\{1\}$ is decisive for y against z on NP^*. But then $g(u3) \neq z$, or n manipulates from $u4$ to $u3$. Hence $g(u3) = x$.

Result 3.

At profile $u5$:

$u5$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-3$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	x	z	z
z	z	z	$\cdots$	z	y	y	y
y	y	y		y	z	x	x

we have $g(u5) = z$ since $\{1, ..., n-3, n-1, n\}$ is decisive for z against y on NP^*. Then at n-variant profile $u6$:

$u6$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-3$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	x	z	z
z	z	z	$\cdots$	z	y	y	x
y	y	y		y	z	x	y

we get $g(u6) = z$ or n manipulates from $u6$ to $u5$.

Main Thread

Combining Result 1 and Result 2, $g(u3) = x$ at $u3$:

$u3$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-3$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	x	z	z
y	y	z	$\cdots$	z	z	y	x
z	z	y		y	y	x	y

and also x is chosen at new profile $u7$:

$u7$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-3$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	x	z	z
y	z	z	$\cdots$	z	y	y	x
z	y	y		y	z	x	y

where y and z are switched for individuals 2 and $n-2$. But then 1 manipulates from $u6$ to $u7$.

Case $L3$.C: For our final case, we assume $\{n-1, n\}$ is a minimal set decisive for y against z and for z against y for $g|NP^*$. We assume x is chosen at $L3$:

$L3$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	y	z
z	z	z	$\cdots$	z	x	x
y	y	y		y	z	y

and seek a contradiction.

Result 1.

We must also have x chosen at $u1$:

$u1$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	y	z
z	y	z	$\cdots$	z	x	x
y	z	y		y	z	y

or 2 manipulates from $u1$ to $L3$. That implies $g(u2) \neq y$ at 1-variant $u2$:

$u2$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	y	z
x	y	z	$\cdots$	z	x	x
y	z	y		y	z	y

or 1 manipulates from $u2$ to $u1$. Then $g(u3) \neq y$ at n-variant $u3$:

$u3$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	y	x
x	y	z	$\cdots$	z	x	z
y	z	y		y	z	y

or n manipulates from $u3$ to $u2$.

From earlier analysis, $g(L2) \neq x$ at $L2$:

$L2$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	y	x
x	z	z	$\cdots$	z	x	z
y	y	y		y	z	y

Therefore $g(u3) \neq x$ or 2 manipulates from $L2$ to $u3$. Combining, $g(u3) = z$. Then $g(u4) = z$ at n-variant $u4$:

$u4$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	y	z
x	y	z	$\cdots$	z	x	y
y	z	y		y	z	x

or n manipulates from $u4$ to $u3$.

Result 2.

From $g(u1) = x$, we have $g(u5) \neq z$ at n-variant $u5$:

$u5$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	y	z
z	y	z	$\cdots$	z	x	y
y	z	y		y	z	x

or n manipulates from $u1$ to $u5$. We get more detail about $g(u5)$ by observing that y is chosen at $u6$ in NP^*:

$u6$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	y	y
z	y	z	$\cdots$	z	z	z
y	z	y		y	x	x

because $\{n-1, n\}$ is decisive for y against z on NP^*. Therefore at $(n-1)$-variant $u7$

$u7$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	y	y
z	y	z	$\cdots$	z	x	z
y	z	y		y	z	x

we have $g(u7) = y$ or $n-1$ manipulates from $u7$ to $u6$. But then $g(u5) \neq x$ or n manipulates from $u5$ to $u7$. Combining, $g(u5) = y$.

Main Thread

We now know that y is chosen at $u5$

$u5$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
x	x	x		x	y	z
z	y	z	$\cdots$	z	x	y
y	z	y		y	z	x

by Result 2 and z is chosen at $u4$

$u4$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	x		x	y	z
x	y	z	$\cdots$	z	x	y
y	z	y		y	z	x

by Result 1. But then 1 manipulates from $u5$ to $u4$. $\square$

4. N−Range Theorem: Part 2.

In this section we prove

Theorem 4-1. (The N-Range Theorem, Part 2). If $m = 3$ and $g|NP^*$ has range of just one alternative then g must be of less than full range on NP.

The problem here is in one sense easier and in another sense harder than in Section 3. It is easier because we don't have to treat the many possible comprehensive collections of decisive sets that had to be considered there. It is harder because we have to show something a bit more complicated. In Section 3, we showed a contrapositive:

$$|Range(g|NP^*)| = 2 \text{ implies } |Range(g)| = 2.$$

But

$$|Range(g|NP^*)| = 1 \text{ does not imply } |Range(g)| = 1.$$

Example 1. For $n > 3$, let $X = \{x, y, z\}$ and define g on NP as follows: Only x and y are ever chosen; x is chosen unless everyone in $\{1, 2, ..., n-2\}$ and one of $n-1$ and n prefer y to x, in which case, y is chosen. Then g is strategy-proof with $Range(g) = \{x, y\}$, but Range$(g|NP^*) = \{x\}$.

Section 4-1. Lists

We will assume g is strategy-proof with $Range(g|NP^*) = \{x\}$ and then construct a very short list L of profiles such that if y is chosen at any profile in NP it will also have to be chosen at a profile in L and also a very short list L^* of profiles such that if z is chosen at any profile in NP it will also have to be chosen at a profile in L^*. Then, for each profile u in L, we will show that if $y = g(u)$, then for every profile u^* in L^*, $g(u^*)$ will not be z, so that $y = g(u)$ implies z is not chosen at any profile in NP and thus that g is not of full range.

To construct list L, we will analyze which profiles u (not in NP^*) could have $g(u) = y$ by paying attention to the positions of x in $u(n-1)$ and $u(n)$. Once this is done, then L^* can be constructed by interchanging y and z in the profiles in L.

Case 1. Suppose $g(u) = y$ and x is at the bottom of both $u(n-1)$ and $u(n)$. Then if we can't switch y and z in $u(n-1)$ and stay in NP and so NP^* to get profile u' where x is chosen, then we can switch y and z in $u(n)$ and stay in NP and so $NP^*$to get profile u' where x is chosen. Then the individual switching has an incentive to manipulate back from u' to u, violating strategy-proofness. Similarly, $g(u) = z$ would lead to a violation of strategy-proofness.

Case 2. Suppose $g(u) = y$ and x is at the top of both $u(n-1)$ and $u(n)$. Then if we can't switch y and z in $u(n-1)$ and stay in NP and so $NP^*$to get profile u' where x is chosen, then we can switch y and z in $u(n)$ and stay in NP and so $NP^*$to get profile u' where x is chosen. Then the individual switching has an incentive to manipulate from u to u', violating strategy-proofness. Similarly, $g(u) = z$ would lead to a violation of strategy-proofness.

We now interrupt this sequence of case-by-case analyses to learn two useful principles.

Lemma 4-2. If even one of $\{1, 2, ..., n-2\}$ has x at the top at u, then $g(u) = x$.

Without loss of generality, suppose #1 has x at the top. Then construct u' by bringing x to the bottom for everyone else, leaving everyone's ordering of y and z unchanged. Then u' is in NP and Case 1 implies $g(u') = x$. Consider the standard sequence from u' to u. Each profile in this sequence is in NP and strategy-proofness implies x is chosen at each stage. So $g(u) = x$.

Lemma 4-3. If at $u \in NP$ we have $g(u) = y$, then none of the individuals in $\{1, 2, ..., n-2\}$ has y at the bottom.

Suppose to the contrary $g(u) = y$; without loss of generality, suppose #1 has the ordering $1 : zxy$ (it can't be xzy by Lemma 4-2). If anyone else has z preferred to x, then #1 could interchange x and z to get x (by Lemma 4-2) and gain. Strategy-proofness thus implies $x \succ_i z$ for all i in $\{2, 3, ..., n\}$. If any of these individuals has y at top or bottom, that individual could interchange x and z and still leave y chosen. But then #1 could interchange x and z to get x (by Lemma 4-2) and gain. Therefore everyone in $\{2, 3, ..., n\}$ must have the ordering xyz. But then $u(n-1) = u(n)$ and we would violate Range$(g|NP^*) = \{x\}$.

By Lemmas 4-2 and 4-3, if $g(u) = y$, then all of $1, 2, ..., n-2$ have $y \succ_i x$ at u. So at least one of $n-1$ and n has $x \succ_i y$. We now we return to our case-by-case analysis.

Case 3. One of $n-1$ and n has x on the bottom and the other has x in the middle. Without loss of generality u is

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
y	y	y	$\cdots$	y	y	z
x	x	x		x	z	x
					x	y

and $g(u) = y$. Now z can be brought to the bottom for 1 and 2 while for $3, ..., n-2$, x is brought to the bottom and y to the top, staying in NP, and still have y chosen by strategy-proofness. This is $L1$, the first profile in list L:

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
y	y	y		y	y	z
x	x	z	$\cdots$	z	z	x
z	z	x		x	x	y

(along with other profiles that can be transformed from these by switching x and z everywhere; or switching preferences of $n-1$ and n or, for $L1$ or, later, $L2$, choosing a different individual with different ordering from others in $\{1, 2, ..., n-2\}$, but all of these will be equivalent in that if a strategy-proof rule could have x chosen at one but not on NP^*, then a rule could be designed that had y chosen at any other one but not on NP^*).

Case 4. Here x is in the middle for both. Since we are not in NP^*, $u(n)$ must be the inverse of $u(n-1)$. Without loss of generality, u is

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
y	y	y	$\cdots$	y	y	z
x	x	x		x	x	x
					z	y

and $g(u) = y$. We will still have y chosen if z is brought to the bottom for 1 and 2, while for $3, ..., n-2$, x is brought to the bottom and y to the top, and then interchange x and z for $n-1$. But that is $L1$, so we don't need to expand list L for Case 4. That is, if y is chosen at a Case 4 profile, it must also be chosen at a Case 1 profile.

Case 5. One of $n-1$ and n has x on the top and the other has x in the middle; without loss of generality, $n-1$ has x on the top. We split this into subcases depending on which of y and z is at the top of n's ordering.

Subcase 5-1. Individual n has z on top; u is

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
y	y	y	$\cdots$	y	x	z
x	x	x		x		x
						y

with $g(u) = y$. If anyone in $\{1, 2, ..., n-2\}$ has z above x, then we could raise x to the top for that individual and still have y chosen, contrary to Lemma 4-2. So everyone in $\{1, 2, ..., n-2\}$ has x above z:

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
y	y	y		y	x	z
x	x	x	$\cdots$	x		x
z	z	z		z		y

But then raising y to the top for $n-1$ and lowering x to the bottom for $3, ..., n-2$ leaves y chosen and we are back to profile $L1$, so we don't need to expand list L for Subcase 5-1.

Subcase 5-2. Individual n has y on top; u is

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
y	y	y	$\cdots$	y	x	y
x	x	x		x		x
						z

with $g(u) = y$.

If $n-1$ has y preferred to z, then at least one of $1, 2, ..., n-2$ must have z preferred to y, say individual 1. Bring z to the bottom for the others in $\{1, 2, ..., n-2\}$ and y is chosen at say

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	y		y	x	y
y	x	x	$\cdots$	x	y	x
x	z	z		z	z	z

Then interchange x and z below y for $3, ..., n-2$ to get

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	y		y	x	y
y	x	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
x	z	x		x	z	z

which we add as $L2$, to the list L (along with related profiles as remarked at the end of Case 3).

On the other hand, if $n-1$ has z preferred to y, then we observe that at least one of $1, 2, ..., n-2$ must have z preferred to x, say individual 2. Bring z to the bottom for 1 and 2 while bringing x to the bottom for $3, ..., n-2$ and then raise y to the top for #1 and y is still chosen at

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
y	y	y		y	x	y
z	x	z	$\cdots$	z	z	x
x	z	x		x	y	z

This is $L3$, the third profile we add to L (along with related profiles).

Case 6. One of $n-1$ and n has x on the top and the other has x on the bottom; without loss of generality, $n-1$ has x on the top.

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
					x	
y	y	y	$\cdots$	y		
x	x	x		x		
						x

Someone has to have $z \succ_i y$. There are three possibilities.

A. One of $\{1, 2, ..., n-2\}$ has $z \succ_i y$, say #1. Then bring z to the bottom for everyone else:

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	y		y	x	y
y	x	x	$\cdots$	x	y	x
x	z	z		z	z	z

and y is still chosen. This puts us in Case 5 and no new profiles need to added to list L.

B. Individual n has $z \succ_n y$. Then z can be brought to the bottom for 1, 2, and $n-1$, while bringing x to the bottom for $3, ..., n-2$ and still have y chosen:

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
y	y	y		y	x	z
x	x	z	$\cdots$	z	y	y
z	z	x		x	z	x

which is $L4$, the fourth profile in list L.

C. Individual $n-1$ has $z \succ_{n-1} y$ and everyone else has $y \succ_i z$ (or we are back in A or B):

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
y	y	y		y	x	y
$[x,z]$	$[x,z]$	$[x,z]$	$\cdots$	$[x,z]$	z	z
					y	x

where [x,z] indicates that x and z can be ordered in any manner below y for each individual. Then y will still be chosen if we make z just above x for #1 and then raise x just above z in n's ordering. This puts us in Case 5 and no new profiles need to added to list L.

Summarizing, the list L consists of

$L1$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
y	y	y		y	y	z
x	x	z	$\cdots$	z	z	x
z	z	x		x	x	y

$L2$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	y		y	x	y
y	x	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
x	z	x		x	z	z

$L3$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
y	y	y		y	x	y
z	x	z	$\cdots$	z	z	x
x	z	x		x	y	z

$L4$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
y	y	y		y	x	z
x	x	z	$\cdots$	z	y	y
z	z	x		x	z	x

along with other profiles that can be transformed from these by switching x and z everywhere; or switching preferences of $n-1$ and n or, for $L1$ or $L2$, choosing an alternative individual with different ordering from others in $\{1, 2, ..., n-2\}$, but all of these will be equivalent in that if a strategy-proof rule could have x chosen at one but not on NP^*, then a rule could be designed that had y chosen at any other one but not on NP^*.

An analogous argument allows the construction of list L^* such that if z is chosen at any profile in NP, then z must be chosen at a profile in the list L^*.

L^* can be obtained simply by interchanging y and z in list L (along with other profiles that can be transformed from these by switching x and y everywhere; or switching preferences of $n-1$ and n or permuting the individuals in $\{1, 2, ..., n-2\}$, but all of these will be equivalent in that if a strategy-proof rule could have z chosen at one but not on NP^*, then a rule could be designed that had z chosen at any other one but not on NP^*).

List L^* is:

$L1^*$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	z		z	z	y
x	x	y	$\cdots$	y	y	x
y	y	x		x	x	z

$L2^*$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
y	z	z		z	x	z
z	x	y	$\cdots$	y	z	x
x	y	x		x	y	y

$L3^*$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	z		z	x	z
y	x	y	$\cdots$	y	y	x
x	y	x		x	z	y

$L4^*$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	z		z	x	y
x	x	y	$\cdots$	y	z	z
y	y	x		x	y	x

Our goal then is, for each choice of Li to assume $g(Li) = y$, to then show that each $g(Lj^*) \neq z$. We actually will establish the stronger result that each $g(Lj^*) = x$. We can simplify our analyses by introducing yet another list, L^{**}:

$L1^{**}$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	y		y	z	y
x	x	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
y	y	x		x	x	z

$L2^{**}$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
y	z	y		y	x	z
z	x	z	$\cdots$	z	z	x
x	y	x		x	y	y

$L3^{**}$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	y		y	x	z
y	x	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
x	y	x		x	z	y

$L4^{**}$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	y		y	x	y
x	x	z	$\cdots$	z	z	z
y	y	x		x	y	x

For each Lj^{*}, the profile Lj^{**} changes zyx to yzx for individuals $3, ..., n-2$. (Alternative x is also ranked at the bottom of $Lj(i)$ for $3 \leq i \leq n-2$ for all j).

Lemma 4-4.For a strategy-proof rule g,

$$g(Lj^{**}) = x \; implies \; g(Lj^{*}) = x.$$

Proof: Just construct a standard sequence, switching each ordering in turn; strategy-proofness implies that x is chosen at each step. □

Lemma 4-5. For a strategy-proof rule g, $g(L3^{**}) = x$ implies $g(L2^{**}) = x$ (and so, by Lemma 4-4, $g(L2^{*}) = x$).

Proof: Suppose $g(L3^{**}) = x$ at

$L3^{**}$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	y		y	x	z
y	x	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
x	y	x		x	z	y

This is a 1-variant of the profile

$u1$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
y	z	y		y	x	z
z	x	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
x	y	x		x	z	y

Then $g(u1) = x$ or 1 manipulates from $L3^{**}$ to $u1$. Next notice that $L2^{**}$ is an $(n-1)$-variant of $u1$:

$L2^{**}$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
y	z	y		y	x	z
z	x	z	$\cdots$	z	z	x
x	y	x		x	y	y

so $g(L2^{**}) = x$ or $n-1$ manipulates from $L2^{**}$ to $u1$. □

Proof of Theorem 4-1: Because of Lemmas 4-4 and 4-5, we will show that if $g|NP^{*}$ has range $\{x\}$ then for each $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, $g(Li) = y$ implies $g(Lj^{**}) = x$ for all $j = 1, 3, 4$ (but see Section 4-2-4).

Section 4-2. Assume $g(L1) = y$.

It continues to be necessary to check that each profile employed is actually in NP. But one must do so with reference to the preferences of individuals $1, 2, n-1$, and n only as we might have $n = 4$.

Subsection 4-2-1. Proof that $g(L1^{**}) = x$.

Step 1

Let profile $u1$ be

$u1$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	y	z	y		y	z	z
	x	x	z	$\cdots$	z	y	y
	z	y	x		x	x	x

Then $g(u1) = x$ since $u1 \in NP^*$. Now consider n-variant $u2$:

$u2$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	y	z	y		y	z	z
	x	x	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
	z	y	x		x	x	y

Still $g(u2) = x$ or n would manipulate from $u1$ to $u2$. Then look at 2-variant $u3$:

$u3$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	y	y	y		y	z	z
	x	x	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
	z	z	x		x	x	y

Then $g(u3) \neq z$ or 2 would manipulate from $u2$ to $u3$. But now consider profile $L1$:

$L1$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	y	y	y		y	y	z
	x	x	z	$\cdots$	z	z	x
	z	z	x		x	x	y

We are assuming $g(L1) = y$. This profile is an $(n-1)$-variant of $u3$. If $g(u3) = x$, individual $n-1$ would manipulate from $u3$ to $L1$. So $g(u3) \neq x$. Combining with $g(u3) \neq z$, we have $g(u3) = y$.

Next consider profile $u4$, a 1-variant of $u3$:

$u4$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	z	y	y		y	z	z
	y	x	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
	x	z	x		x	x	y

If $g(u4) = x$, then 1 would manipulate from $u4$ to $u3$; so $g(u4) \neq x$.

Step 2

Consider profile $u5$ in NP^*:

$u5$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	z	y	y		y	z	z
	x	x	z	$\cdots$	z	y	y
	y	z	x		x	x	x

Then $g(u5) = x$. Look at n-variant profile $u6$

$u6$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	z	y	y		y	z	z
	x	x	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
	y	z	x		x	x	y

We have $g(u6) = x$ or else n would manipulate from $u5$ to $u6$. But $u6$ is also a 1-variant of $u4$. If $g(u4) = z$, 1 would manipulate from $u6$ to $u4$. So $g(u4) \neq z$.

Step 3

Combining Steps 1 and 2, $g(u4) = y$. Then look at $u7$, an n-variant of $u4$:

$u7$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	z	y	y		y	z	x
	y	x	z	$\cdots$	z	y	y
	x	z	x		x	x	z

$g(u7) = y$ or n manipulates from $u4$ to $u7$. Consider the 2-variant of $u7$:

$u8$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	z	y	y		y	z	x
	y	z	z	$\cdots$	z	y	y
	x	x	x		x	x	z

$g(u8) = y$ or 2 would manipulate from $u8$ to $u7$. Then at profile $u9$, a 1-variant of $u8$:

$u9$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	z	y	y		y	z	x
	x	z	z	$\cdots$	z	y	y
	y	x	x		x	x	z

we have $g(u9) \neq z$ or 1 would manipulate from $u8$ to $u9$.

Step 4

We next want to show $g(u9) \neq y$. But look at $u10$:

$u10$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	x	y	y		y	z	z
	z	z	z	$\cdots$	z	y	y
	y	x	x		x	x	x

$g(u10) = x$ since $u10 \in NP^*$. But then at $u11$, an n-variant of $u10$:

$u11$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	x	y	y		y	z	x
	z	z	z	$\cdots$	z	y	y
	y	x	x		x	x	z

we get $g(u11) = x$ or n manipulates from $u10$ to $u11$ (or $u11$ to $u10$). Now $u9$

is a 1-variant of $u11$. If $g(u9) = y$, individual 1 would manipulate from $u9$ to $u11$; so $g(u9) \neq y$. Combining with Step 3, $g(u9) = x$.

Final Thread

Consider profile

$u12$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	y		y	z	y
x	z	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
y	x	x		x	x	z

$u12$ is an n-variant of $u9$. If $g(u12) = z$, then n would manipulate from $u12$ to $u9$. So $g(u12) \neq z$.

Next consider profile $u13$:

$u13$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	y		y	y	y
x	z	z	$\cdots$	z	x	x
y	x	x		x	z	z

Here $g(u13) = x$ since $u13$ is in NP^*. Profile $u13$ is an $(n-1)$-variant of $u12$. If $g(u12) = y$, individual $n-1$ would manipulate from $u13$ to $u12$. So $g(u12) \neq y$. Therefore $g(u12) = x$. Then look at $L1^{**}$, a 2-variant $u12$:

$L1^{**}$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	y		y	z	y
x	x	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
y	y	x		x	x	z

Then $g(L1^{**}) = x$ or 2 would manipulate from $u12$ to $L1^{**}$.

Subsection 4-2-2. Proof that $g(L3^{**}) = x$.

Step 1

We start at profile

$u1$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	y		y	z	z
x	x	z	$\cdots$	z	x	x
y	z	x		x	y	y

where $g(u1) = x$ since $u1 \in NP^*$. Then, at $u2$, an $(n-1)$-variant of $u1$:

$u2$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	y		y	y	z
x	x	z	$\cdots$	z	z	x
y	z	x		x	x	y

we see $g(u2) \neq z$ or $n-1$ manipulates from $u1$ to $u2$. Next consider $u3$, a 1-variant of $u2$:

$u3$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	y		y	y	z
y	x	z	$\cdots$	z	z	x
x	z	x		x	x	y

If $g(u3) = z$, then 1 manipulates from $u2$ to $u3$, so $g(u3) \neq z$. But $u3$ is also a 1-variant of $L1$:

$L1$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
y	y	y		y	y	z
x	x	z	$\cdots$	z	z	x
z	z	x		x	x	y

$g(L1) = y$ by assumption. If $g(u3) = x$, then 1 would manipulate from $u3$ to $L1$. So $g(u3) \neq x$. Combining, $g(u3) = y$.

Next consider

$u4$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	y		y	y	z
y	x	z	$\cdots$	z	x	x
x	z	x		x	z	y

This is an $(n-1)$-variant of $u3$ and $g(u4) = y$ or else $n-1$ would manipulate from $u4$ to $u3$. Then look at $u5$, a 2-variant of $u4$:

$u5$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	y		y	y	z
y	z	z	$\cdots$	z	x	x
x	x	x		x	z	y

We have $g(u5) = y$ or 2 would manipulate from $u5$ to $u4$. For the last part of this step, consider $u6$, an $(n-1)$-variant of $u5$:

$u6$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	y		y	x	z
y	z	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
x	x	x		x	z	y

Then $g(u6) \neq z$ or $n-1$ manipulates from $u6$ to $u5$.

Step 2

Look at profile $u7$:

$u7$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
y	y	y		y	z	z
x	z	z	$\cdots$	z	x	x
z	x	x		x	y	y

$g(u7) = x$ since $u7 \in NP^*$. Then look at $u8$, an $(n-1)$-variant of $u7$:

$u8$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
y	y	y		y	x	z
x	z	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
z	x	x		x	z	y

Then $g(u8) = x$ or $n-1$ manipulates from $u8$ to $u7$. But $u8$ is also a 1-variant of $u6$. If $g(u6) = y$, individual 1 would manipulate from $u8$ to $u6$. So $g(u6) \neq y$.

Final Thread

Combining Steps 1 and 2, $g(u6) = x$. But $L3^{**}$:

$L3^{**}$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	y		y	x	z
y	x	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
x	y	x		x	z	y

is a 2-variant of $u6$, so $g(L3^{**}) = x$ or 2 manipulates from $u6$ to $L3^{**}$.

Subsection 4-2-3. Proof that $g(L4^{**}) = x$.

Step 1

We start from

$u1$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	y		y	y	y
x	x	z	$\cdots$	z	z	z
y	z	x		x	x	x

where $g(u1) = x$ since $u1 \in NP^*$. Then at $(n-1)$-variant $u2$:

$u2$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	y		y	x	y
x	x	z	$\cdots$	z	z	z
y	z	x		x	y	x

we also have $g(u2) = x$ or $n-1$ manipulates from $u1$ to $u2$ or from $u2$ to $u1$. Then at 2-variant profile $u3$:

$u3$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	y		y	x	y
x	z	z	$\cdots$	z	z	z
y	x	x		x	y	x

we see that $g(u3) \neq y$ or 2 would manipulate from $u2$ to $u3$.

Step 2

We start again from a profile in NP^*:

$u4$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
y	y	y		y	z	z
x	z	z	$\cdots$	z	x	x
z	x	x		x	y	y

so $g(u4) = x$. Then at profile $u5$, an $(n-1)$-variant of $u4$:

$u5$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
y	y	y		y	x	z
x	z	z	$\cdots$	z	z	x
z	x	x		x	y	y

we see $g(u5) = x$ or $n-1$ manipulates from $u5$ to $u4$. Next examine $u6$, a 1-variant of $u5$:

$u6$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
y	y	y		y	x	z
z	z	z	$\cdots$	z	z	x
x	x	x		x	y	y

We have $g(u6) \neq y$ or 1 manipulates from $u5$ to $u6$. But we saw earlier that $g(L3^{**}) = x$ so, by Lemma 4-5, $g(L2^{**}) = x$

$L2^{**}$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
y	z	y		y	x	z
z	x	z	$\cdots$	z	z	x
x	y	x		x	y	y

Profile $L2^{**}$ is a 2-variant of $u6$; if $g(u6) = z$, then 2 would manipulate from $L2^{**}$ to $u6$. So $g(u6) \neq z$. Combining, $g(u6) = x$.

Now profile $u6$ is also a 1-variant of profile $u7$:

$u7$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	y		y	x	z
x	z	z	$\cdots$	z	z	x
y	x	x		x	y	y

So $g(u7) = x$ or 1 manipulates from $u6$ to $u7$. Profile $u7$ is also an n-variant of $u3$. If $g(u3) = z$, n would manipulate from $u7$ to $u3$. Therefore, $g(u3) \neq z$.

Final Thread

Combining Steps 1 and 2, we get $g(u3) = x$. But $u3$ is a 2-variant of $L4^{**}$:‘

$L4^{**}$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	y		y	x	y
x	x	z	$\cdots$	z	z	z
y	y	x		x	y	x

If $g(L4^{**}) \neq x$, then 2 would manipulate from $u3$ to $L4^{*}$; therefore, $g(L4^{**}) = x$.

Subsection 4-2-4. Other profiles.

We have shown that if Range$(g|NP^{*}) = \{x\}$ and $g(L1) = y$ then z is not chosen at any of the profiles in the list L^{**}. But L^{**} was constructed by making some arbitrary choices about profiles after having made some choices to get list L. Those arbitrary choices in the construction of L^{**} then may not satisfy a “without loss of generality” argument. We need to consider what happens with other choices. Of course we would like to treat all possibilities, but there are very many and each is dealt with fairly straightforwardly.

For example, construct profile $T1^{*}$ that differs from $L3^{**}$ by

(I) interchanging the preference orderings for individual 1 and 2; and also

(II) interchanging the preference orderings for individual $n-1$ and n.

$T1^*$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	y		y	z	x
x	y	z	$\cdots$	z	x	y
y	x	x		x	y	z

We will show $g(T1^*) \neq z$; in fact, we can show $g(T1^*) = x$.

Earlier, in our analysis of $L1^{**}$, we showed x is chosen at the following profile (which was called $u12$ back there):

$u1$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	y		y	z	y
x	z	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
y	x	x		x	x	z

Then at 2-variant profile $u2$:

$u2$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	y		y	z	y
x	y	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
y	x	x		x	x	z

we get $g(u2) = x$ or 2 manipulates from $u1$ to $u2$. Finally consider $u3$, an $(n-1)$-variant of $u2$:

$u3$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	y		y	z	y
x	y	z	$\cdots$	z	x	x
y	x	x		x	y	z

Then $g(u3) = x$ or $n-1$ manipulates from $u2$ to $u3$. But $u3$ is an n-variant of $T1^*$. If $g(T1^*) \neq x$, n would manipulate from $T1^*$ to $u3$. Therefore $g(T1^*) = x$.

Section 4-3. Assume $g(L2) = y$.

Subsection 4-3-1. Proof that $g(L1^{**}) = x$.

At profile $u1$:

$u1$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	y		y	z	z
y	x	z	$\cdots$	z	x	x
x	z	x		x	y	y

we have $g(u1) = x$ since $u1 \in NP^*$. Consider n-variant profile $u2$

$u2$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	y		y	z	y
y	x	z	$\cdots$	z	x	x
x	z	x		x	y	z

If $g(u2) = z$, then n would manipulate from $u1$ to $u2$ (and u_2 to u_1). So $g(u2) \neq z$. Profile $u2$ is also an $(n-1)$-variant of $L2$:

$L2$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	y		y	x	y
y	x	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
x	z	x		x	z	z

and $g(L2)= y$ by the assumption of this section. If $g(u2) = x$, then $n-1$ manipulates from $L2$ to $u2$. Therefore $g(u2) \neq x$. Combining, $g(u2) = y$.

Now look at $u3$ a 2-variant of $u2$:

$u3$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	y		y	z	y
y	z	z	$\cdots$	z	x	x
x	x	x		x	y	z

Then $g(u3) = y$ or 2 would manipulate from $u3$ to $u2$.

Next, 1-variant profile $u4$:

$u4$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	y		y	z	y
x	z	z	$\cdots$	z	x	x
y	x	x		x	y	z

If $g(u4) = z$, then 1 manipulates from $u3$ to $u4$. So $g(u4) \neq z$. Next, look at $u5$, an $(n-1)$-variant of $u4$:

$u5$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	y		y	y	y
x	z	z	$\cdots$	z	x	x
y	x	x		x	z	z

$g(u5) = x$ since $u5 \in NP^*$. If $g(u4) = y$, then $n-1$ manipulates from $u5$ to $u4$. Therefore, $g(u4) \neq y$. Combining, $g(u4) = x$.

Consider profile $u6$, also an $(n-1)$-variant of $u4$:

$u6$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	y		y	z	y
x	z	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
y	x	x		x	x	z

If $g(u6) = z$, then $n-1$ would manipulate from $u4$ to $u6$. Also $u6$ is an $(n-1)$-variant of $u5$. If $g(u6) = y$, then $n-1$ would manipulate from $u5$ to $u6$. Combining, $g(u6) = x$.

But $u6$ is a 2-variant of $L1^{**}$:

$L1^{**}$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	y		y	z	y
x	x	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
y	y	x		x	x	z

$g(L1^{**}) = x$ or 2 would manipulate from $u6$ to $L1^{**}$.

Subsection 4-3-2. Proof that $g(L3^{**}) = x$.

Step 1

We start with profile $u1$:

$u1$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	y		y	y	y
y	z	z	$\cdots$	z	z	z
x	y	x		x	x	x

where $g(u1) = x$ since $u1 \in NP^*$. Then look at $(n-1)$-variant $u2$:

$u2$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	y		y	x	y
y	z	z	$\cdots$	z	y	z
x	y	x		x	z	x

$g(u2) = x$ or $n-1$ manipulates from $u1$ to $u2$. Next consider 2-variant profile $u3$:

$u3$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	y		y	x	y
y	x	z	$\cdots$	z	y	z
x	y	x		x	z	x

If $g(u3) = y$, then 2 manipulates from $u3$ to $u2$. So $g(u3) \neq y$.

Step 2

By assumption, at $L2$:

$L2$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	y		y	x	y
y	x	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
x	z	x		x	z	z

we have $g(L2) = y$. Then at 2-variant profile $u4$:

$u4$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	y		y	x	y
y	y	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
x	x	x		x	z	z

we have $g(u4) \neq x$ or 2 manipulates from $u4$ to $L2$. Next, at profile $u5$:

$u5$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	y		y	y	y
y	x	z	$\cdots$	z	x	x
x	y	x		x	z	z

we have $g(u5) = x$ since $u5 \in NP^*$. Then at $(n-1)$-variant

$u6$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	y		y	x	y
y	x	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
x	y	x		x	z	z

we get $g(u6) = x$ or $n-1$ manipulates from $u6$ to $u5$. But $u6$ is a 2-variant of $u4$ and if $g(u4) = z$, then 2 would manipulate from $u6$ to $u4$. So $g(u4) \neq z$. Combining, $g(u4) = y$.

Final thread

Profile $u7$ is an n-variant of $u4$:

$u7$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	y		y	x	y
y	y	z	$\cdots$	z	y	z
x	x	x		x	z	x

Since $g(u4) = y$, we must have $g(u7) = y$. But $u7$ is also a 2-variant of $u3$. If $g(u3) = z$, then 2 would manipulate from $u7$ to $u3$. Combining, $g(u3) = x$.

Profile $L3^{**}$ is

$L3^{**}$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	y		y	x	z
y	x	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
x	y	x		x	z	y

and so is an n-variant of $u3$. Then $g(L3^{**}) = x$ or n would manipulate from $u3$ to $L3^{**}$.

Subsection 4-3-3. Proof that $g(L4^{**})= x$.

Step 1

At $u1$:

$u1$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	y		y	x	x
y	y	z	$\cdots$	z	y	y
x	x	x		x	z	z

$g(u1) = x$ since $u1 \in NP^{*}$. Profile $u2$ is an $(n-1)$-variant of $u1$:

$u2$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	y		y	x	x
y	y	z	$\cdots$	z	z	y
x	x	x		x	y	z

$g(u2) = x$ or $n-1$ manipulates from $u2$ to $u1$. Then look at n-variant profile $u3$:

$u3$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	y		y	x	y
y	y	z	$\cdots$	z	z	x
x	x	x		x	y	z

If $g(u3) = z$, then n would manipulate from $u3$ to $u2$. So $g(u3) \neq z$.

Step 2

Now we are assuming that y is chosen at $L2$:

$L2$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	y		y	x	y
y	x	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
x	z	x		x	z	z

So at 2-variant profile $u4$:

$u4$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	y		y	x	y
y	y	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
x	x	x		x	z	z

$g(u4) \neq x$ or 2 manipulates from $u4$ to $L2$. But $u3$ is also an $(n-1)$-variant of $u4$ and if $g(u3) = x$, $n-1$ would manipulate from $u4$ to $u3$. So $g(u3) \neq x$.

Step 3

Combining Steps 1 and 2, $g(u3) = y$. So at $u5$, an n-variant of $u3$:

$u5$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	y		y	x	y
y	y	z	$\cdots$	z	z	z
x	x	x		x	y	x

$g(u5) = y$ or n manipulates from $u5$ to $u3$.

Step 4

Profile $u6$ is in NP^*:

$u6$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	y		y	y	y
y	z	z	$\cdots$	z	z	z
x	x	x		x	x	x

so $g(u6) = x$. Then at $(n-1)$-variant profile $u7$:

$u7$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	y		y	x	y
y	z	z	$\cdots$	z	z	z
x	y	x		x	y	x

$g(u7) = x$ or $n-1$ would manipulate from $u7$ to $u6$.

Final thread

Consider profile $u8$:

$u8$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	y		y	x	y
y	x	z	$\cdots$	z	z	z
x	y	x		x	y	x

Profile $u8$ is a 2-variant of $u5$ and also a 2-variant of $u7$. By Step 3, $g(u5) = y$, so $g(u8) \neq z$ or 2 manipulates from $u5$ to $u8$. By Step 4, $g(u7) = x$, so $g(u8) \neq y$, or 2 manipulates from $u8$ to $u7$. Hence $g(u8) = x$. But $u8$ is a 1-variant of $L4^{**}$:

$L4^{**}$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	y		y	x	y
x	x	z	$\cdots$	z	z	z
y	y	x		x	y	x

so $g(L4^{**}) = x$ or 1 would manipulate from $u8$ to $L4^{**}$.

Section 4-4. Assume $g(L3) = y$.

Subsection 4-4-1. Proof that $g(L1^{**}) = x$.

At $L3$:

$L3$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
y	y	y		y	x	y
z	x	z	$\cdots$	z	z	x
x	z	x		x	y	z

we have $g(L3) = y$ by assumption. Then at 1-variant profile $u1$

$u1$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	y		y	x	y
y	x	z	$\cdots$	z	z	x
x	z	x		x	y	z

we get $g(u1) \neq x$ or 1 would manipulate from $u1$ to $L3$. Next, at $u2$, an n-variant of $u1$:

$u2$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	y		y	x	x
y	x	z	$\cdots$	z	z	z
x	z	x		x	y	y

$g(u2) = x$ since $u2 \in NP^*$. If $g(u1) = z$, then n would manipulate from $u1$ to $u2$. So $g(u1) \neq z$. Combining, $g(u1) = y$.

The next profile, $u3$, is an $(n-1)$-variant of $u1$:

$u3$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	y		y	z	y
y	x	z	$\cdots$	z	x	x
x	z	x		x	y	z

$g(u3) = y$ or $n-1$ would manipulate from $u1$ to $u3$.

Step 2

Now look at profile $u4$, a 2-variant of $u3$:

$u4$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	z	y	y		y	z	y
	y	z	z	$\cdots$	z	x	x
	x	x	x		x	y	z

Then $g(u4) = y$ or 2 manipulates from $u4$ to $u3$. Next, look at 1-variant $u5$:

$u5$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	z	y	y		y	z	y
	x	z	z	$\cdots$	z	x	x
	y	x	x		x	y	z

If $g(u5) = z$, 1 would manipulate from $u4$ to $u5$. So $g(u5) \neq z$. Then look at $u6$, an $(n-1)$-variant of $u5$:

$u6$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	z	y	y		y	y	y
	x	z	z	$\cdots$	z	x	x
	y	x	x		x	z	z

$g(u6) = x$ since $u6 \in NP^*$. If $g(u5) = y$, then $n-1$ manipulates from $u6$ to $u5$. So $g(u5) \neq y$. Combining, $g(u5) = x$.

Final thread

Consider profile $u7$:

$u7$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	z	y	y		y	z	y
	x	z	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
	y	x	x		x	x	z

$u7$ is an $(n-1)$-variant of $u6$ and of $u5$. If $g(u7) = y$, then $n-1$ manipulates from $u6$ to $u7$; if $g(u7) = z$, then $n-1$ manipulates from $u5$ to $u7$. So $g(u7) = x$.

Now $L1^{**}$ is given by:

$L1^{**}$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	z	z	y		y	z	y
	x	x	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
	y	y	x		x	x	z

so $g(L1^{**}) = x$ or else 2 would manipulate from $u7$ to $L1^{**}$.

Subsection 4-4-2. Proof that $g(L3^{**}) = x$.

Step 1

At profile $u1$ in NP^*:

$u1$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	y		y	y	y
y	y	z	$\cdots$	z	z	z
x	z	x		x	x	x

$g(u1) = x$. Then at $u2$, an $(n-1)$-variant of $u1$:

$u2$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	y		y	x	y
y	y	z	$\cdots$	z	y	z
x	z	x		x	z	x

$g(u2) = x$ or $n-1$ manipulates from $u2$ to $u1$. Then consider $u3$, a 2-variant of $u2$:

$u3$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	y		y	x	y
y	x	z	$\cdots$	z	y	z
x	y	x		x	z	x

If $g(u3) = y$, then 2 would manipulate from $u3$ to $u2$. So $g(u3) \neq y$.

Step 2

Now look at profile $u4$:

$u4$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	y		y	y	y
y	x	z	$\cdots$	z	x	x
x	y	x		x	z	z

$g(u4) = x$ since $u4 \in NP^*$. Then consider $(n-1)$-variant profile $u5$:

$u5$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	y		y	x	y
y	x	z	$\cdots$	z	z	x
x	y	x		x	y	z

$g(u5) = x$ or $n-1$ manipulates from $u5$ to $u4$. Next look at $u6$, a 2-variant of $u5$:

$u6$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	y		y	x	y
y	y	z	$\cdots$	z	z	x
x	x	x		x	y	z

If $g(u6) = z$, then 2 manipulates from $u5$ to $u6$. So $g(u6) \neq z$. This profile $u6$ is also a 2-variant of $u7$:

$u7$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	y		y	x	y
y	x	z	$\cdots$	z	z	x
x	z	x		x	y	z

It was shown in Subsection 4-4-1 that $g(L3) = y$ implies $g(u7) = y$ (in that subsection, this profile was called $u1$). If $g(u6) = x$, then 2 would manipulate from $u6$ to $u7$. So $g(u6) \neq x$. Combining, $g(u6) = y$.

Step 3

Then at profile $u8$, an $(n-1)$-variant of $u6$:

$u8$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	y		y	x	y
y	y	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
x	x	x		x	z	z

we have $g(u8) = y$ or $n-1$ manipulates from $u6$ to $u8$. Now look at profile $u9$, an n-variant of $u8$:

$u9$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	y		y	x	y
y	y	z	$\cdots$	z	y	z
x	x	x		x	z	x

$g(u9) = y$ or n manipulates from $u9$ to $u8$. But $u9$ is a 2-variant of $u3$. If $g(u3) = z$, 2 manipulates from $u9$ to $u3$. So $g(u3) \neq z$.

Final thread

From Step 1, we got $g(u3) \neq y$; from step 3, $g(u3) \neq z$. So $g(u3) = x$. But $u3$ is an n-variant of $L3^{**}$:

$L3^{**}$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	y		y	x	z
y	x	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
x	y	x		x	z	y

$g(L3^{**}) = x$ or n would manipulate from $L3^{**}$ to $u3$ (and $u3$ to $L3^{**}$).

Subsection 4-4-3. Proof that $g(L4^{**}) = x$.

In the previous subsection, we found x is chosen at profile $u1$ (called $u3$ there):

$u1$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	y		y	x	y
y	x	z	$\cdots$	z	y	z
x	y	x		x	z	x

Consider 1-variant profile $u2$:

$u2$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	y		y	x	y
x	x	z	$\cdots$	z	y	z
y	y	x		x	z	x

$g(u2) = x$ or 1 would manipulate from $u1$ to $u2$. But $u2$ is an $(n-1)$-variant of $L4^{**}$:

$L4^{**}$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	y		y	x	y
x	x	z	$\cdots$	z	z	z
y	y	x		x	y	x

So $g(L4^{**}) = x$ or $n-1$ would manipulate from $L4^{**}$ to $u2$.

Section 4-5. Assume $g(L4) = y$.

Subsection 4-5-1. Proof that $g(L1^{**}) = x$.

Step 1

We start from

$L4$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
y	y	y		y	x	z
x	x	z	$\cdots$	z	y	y
z	z	x		x	z	x

$g(L4) = y$ by assumption. Then consider $(n-1)$-variant profile $u1$:

$u1$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
y	y	y		y	z	z
x	x	z	$\cdots$	z	x	y
z	z	x		x	y	x

If $g(u1) = x$, then $n-1$ manipulates from $L4$ to $u1$. So $g(u1) \neq x$.

Step 2

At profile $u2$:

$u2$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
y	x	y		y	z	z
x	z	z	$\cdots$	z	y	y
z	y	x		x	x	x

$g(u2) = x$ since $u2 \in NP^*$. Then look at $(n-1)$-variant $u3$:

$u3$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
y	x	y		y	z	z
x	z	z	$\cdots$	z	x	y
z	y	x		x	y	x

$g(u3) = x$ or $n-1$ would manipulate from $u2$ to $u3$. But $u3$ is a 2-variant of $u1$. If $g(u1) = z$, then $n-1$ would manipulate from $u3$ to $u1$. So $g(u1) \neq z$. Combining with Step 1, $g(u1) = y$.

But then consider profile $u4$, an n-variant of $u1$,

$u4$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
y	y	y		y	z	y
x	x	z	$\cdots$	z	x	x
z	z	x		x	y	z

$g(u4) = y$ or n would manipulate from $u4$ to $u1$. But then at 1-variant $u5$:

$u5$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	y		y	z	y
y	x	z	$\cdots$	z	x	x
x	z	x		x	y	z

we see that if $g(u5) = x$, then 1 would manipulate from $u5$ to $u4$. So $g(u5) \neq x$. But also $g(u5) \neq z$ as can be seen by considering $u6$, an n-variant of $u5$:

$u6$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	y		y	z	z
y	x	z	$\cdots$	z	x	x
x	z	x		x	y	y

$g(u6) = x$ since $u6 \in NP^*$. If $g(u5) = z$, then n would manipulate from $u6$ to $u5$. Therefore $g(u5) \neq z$. Combining, $g(u5) = y$.

Step 3

Knowing $g(u5) = y$, we look at a 2-variant of $u5$:

$u7$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	y		y	z	y
y	z	z	$\cdots$	z	x	x
x	x	x		x	y	z

$g(u7) = y$ or 2 would manipulate from $u7$ to $u5$. Then at $u8$, a 1-variant of $u7$:

$u8$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	y		y	z	y
x	z	z	$\cdots$	z	x	x
y	x	x		x	y	z

we see that if $g(u8) = z$, then 1 would manipulate from $u7$ to $u8$. So $g(u8) \neq z$. Next look at $(n-1)$-variant $u9$:

$u9$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	y		y	z	y
x	z	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
y	x	x		x	x	z

If $g(u9) = z$, then $n-1$ would manipulate from $u8$ to $u9$. So $g(u9) \neq z$.

Final thread

Consider profile $u10$:

$u10$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	y		y	y	y
x	z	z	$\cdots$	z	x	x
y	x	x		x	z	z

$g(u10) = x$ since $u10 \in NP^*$. But $u10$ is an $(n-1)$-variant of $u9$. If $g(u9) = y$,

then $n-1$ would manipulate from $u10$ to $u9$. So $g(u9) \neq y$. Combining with Step 3, $g(u9) = x$.

Finally, look at $L1^{**}$, a 2-variant of $u9$:

$L1^{**}$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	y		y	z	y
x	x	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
y	y	x		x	x	z

$g(L1^{**}) = x$ or 2 would manipulate from $u9$ to $L1^{**}$.

Subsection 4-5-2. Proof that $g(L3^{**}) = x$.

Step 1

We start from $g(L4) = y$ at

$L4$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
y	y	y		y	x	z
x	x	z	$\cdots$	z	y	y
z	z	x		x	z	x

Then at 1-variant profile $u1$:

$u1$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	y	y		y	x	z
y	x	z	$\cdots$	z	y	y
x	z	x		x	z	x

if $g(u1) = x$, 1 would manipulate from $u1$ to $L4$. So $g(u1) \neq x$.

Step 2

At profile $u2$ in NP^*:

$u2$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	y		y	z	z
y	y	z	$\cdots$	z	y	y
x	z	x		x	x	x

we have $g(u2) = x$. Then consider $(n-1)$-variant profile $u3$:

$u3$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	x	y		y	x	z
y	y	z	$\cdots$	z	y	y
x	z	x		x	z	x

$g(u3) = x$ or $n-1$ would manipulate from $u2$ to $u3$. But $u3$ is a 2-variant of $u1$. If $g(u1) = z$, then 2 manipulates from $u1$ to $u3$. So $g(u1) \neq z$.

Step 3

Combining Steps 1 and 2, we have $g(u1) = y$. Look at 2-variant profile $u4$:

$u4$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	z	y	y		y	x	z
	y	z	z	$\cdots$	z	y	y
	x	x	x		x	z	x

$g(u4) = y$ or 2 would manipulate from $u4$ to $u1$. Now consider $u5$, an n-variant of $u4$:

$u5$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	z	y	y		y	x	z
	y	z	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
	x	x	x		x	z	y

If $g(u5) = z$, then n manipulates from $u4$ to $u5$. So $g(u5) \neq z$.

Step 4

Profile $u6$ is in NP^*:

$u6$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	y	y	y		y	z	z
	x	z	z	$\cdots$	z	x	x
	z	x	x		x	y	y

so $g(u6) = x$. Then $(n-1)$-variant profile $u7$:

$u7$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	y	y	y		y	x	z
	x	z	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
	z	x	x		x	z	y

has $g(u7) = x$ or $n-1$ would manipulate from $u7$ to $u6$. So $g(u7) \neq x$. But $u7$ is also a 1-variant of $u5$. If $g(u5) = y$, then 1 would manipulate from $u7$ to $u5$. So $g(u5) \neq y$.

Final thread

Combining Steps 3 and 4, we get $g(u5) = x$. But $u5$ is a 2-variant of $L3^{**}$:

$L3^{**}$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	z	z	y		y	x	z
	y	x	z	$\cdots$	z	y	x
	x	y	x		x	z	y

$g(L3^{**}) = x$ or 2 would manipulate from $u5$ to $L3^{**}$.

Subsection 4-5-3. Proof that $g(L4^{**}) = x$.

Step 1

We have already shown that $g(L4) = y$ implies $g(L3^{**}) = x$ and thus (by Lemma 4-5), $g(L2^{**}) = x$ at

$L2^{**}$	1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
	y	z	y		y	x	z
	z	x	z	$\cdots$	z	z	x
	x	y	x		x	y	y

Then at n-variant profile $u1$:

$u1$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
y	z	y		y	x	y
z	x	z	$\cdots$	z	z	z
x	y	x		x	y	x

we see that if $g(u1) = z$, n would manipulate from $L2^{**}$ to $u1$. So $g(u1) \neq x$.

Step 2

Next consider profile $u2$:

$u2$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
y	z	y		y	y	y
x	x	z	$\cdots$	z	z	z
z	y	x		x	x	x

$g(u2) = x$ since $u2 \in NP^{*}$. But then look at $(n-1)$-variant profile $u3$:

$u3$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
y	z	y		y	x	y
x	x	z	$\cdots$	z	z	z
z	y	x		x	y	x

$g(u3) = x$ or $n-1$ will manipulate from $u2$ to $u3$. But $u3$ is a 1-variant of $u1$. If $g(u1) = y$ then 1 would manipulate from $u3$ to $u1$. So $g(u1) \neq y$.

Final thread

Combining Steps 1 and 2, $g(u1) = x$. But $u1$ is a 1-variant of $L4^{**}$:

$L4^{**}$

1	2	3	$\cdots$	$n-2$	$n-1$	n
z	z	y		y	x	y
x	x	z	$\cdots$	z	z	z
y	y	x		x	y	x

$g(L4^{**}) = x$ or 1 would manipulate from $u1$ to $L4^{**}$. $\square$

Summarizing, we have shown:

g strategy-proof on $NP \Rightarrow$ [Range$(g) = \{x, y, z\} \Rightarrow$ Range$(g|NP^{*}) = \{x, y, z\}$]

We have actually addressed

g strategy-proof on $NP \Rightarrow$ [Range$(g|NP^{*}) \neq \{x, y, z\} \Rightarrow$ Range$(g) \neq \{x, y, z\}$]

Now Range$(g|NP^{*}) \neq \{x, y, z\}$ can happen in two ways: the range can contain two alternatives or one.

Case 1. $|\text{Range}(g|NP^{*})| = 2$, say Range$(g|NP^{*}) = \{y, z\}$. We first find a list $\{Li\}$ of profiles such that if x is in the Range(g), then $g(Li) = x$ for some i. Then we show that $g(Li) = x$ implies a violation of strategy-proofness.

[This takes up Part 1. What makes this complicated is that all of those violations of strategy-proofness are carried out separately for different decisiveness structures.]

Case 2. $|\text{Range}(g|NP^*)| = 1$, say $\text{Range}(g|NP^*) = \{x\}$. [It is not possible to do the same analysis as Case 1, because there do exist Range-two rules on NP that have a range of one alternative on NP^*.] We first find

(1) a list $\{Li\}$ of profiles such that if y is in Range(g), then $g(Li) = y$ for some i, and

(2) another list $\{Lj^*\}$ of profiles such that if z is in Range(g), then $g(Lj^*) = z$ for some Lj^*.

Then, we show that for each pair, Li, Lj^*, if both $g(Li) = y$ and $g(Lj^*) = z$, then there must be a violation of strategy-proofness.

[In the details, we actually work with a related list $\{Lj^*\}$, and show that strategy-proofness implies $g(Lj^{**}) = x$ and so NOT z.]

5. M-Range Theorem.

We adopt the following construction from companion paper Campbell and Kelly (2014b). Let g be a given strategy-proof social choice function on $NP(n, m+1)$ that has full range. Now we define a rule g^* based on g. Select arbitrary, but distinct, w and z in X. Let $NP^{wz}(n, m+1)$ be the set of profiles in $NP(n, m+1)$ such that alternatives w and z are contiguous in each individual ordering. Choose some alternative x^* that does not belong to X and set $X^* = \{x^*\} \cup X \backslash \{w, z\}$. Then g^* will have domain D^* by which we mean the domain $NP(n, m)$ when the feasible set is X^*. To define g^* we begin by selecting arbitrary profile $p \in D^*$, and then we choose some profile $r \in NP^{wz}(n, m+1)$ such that

1. $r|X\backslash\{w, z\} = p|X\backslash\{w, z\}$, and
2. for any $i \in \{1, 2, ..., n\}$, we have

$$\{x \in X\backslash\{w, z\} : x \succ_{r(i)} w\} = \{x \in X\backslash\{w, z\} : x \succ_{p(i)} x^*\}.$$

In words, we create r from p by replacing x^* with w and z so that w and z are contiguous in each $r(i)$, and r does not exhibit any Pareto domination, and in each $r(i)$ either w or z occupies the same rank as x^* in $p(i)$. In Campbell and Kelly (2014b), we show that the selected alternative, which we can denote $f(p)$, is independent of the choice of profile r and so g^* is well defined.

Lemma 5-1. If g is strategy-proof with range X, then $\text{Range}(g^*) = X^*$.

Before embarking on a proof of this theorem, we have to establish a lemma about moving alternatives w and z closer together in a profile. First, some more terminology and notation.

The *position* of alternative $y \in X$ in the linear ordering $\succ$ on X is the number $1 + |\{y' \in X : y' \succ y\}|$. We say that a ranks above b in $\succ$ if a has a lower position number than b.

For any two distinct alternatives a and b in X and any subset Y of $X\backslash\{a,b\}$ we let $a \succ Y \succ b$ denote the fact that $a \succ y \succ b$ holds for every $y \in Y$.

Let $\sigma_i(r,a,b)$ denote the number of alternatives strictly between a and b in $r(i)$. That is, $\sigma_i(r,a,b)$ is the cardinality of the set

$$\{y \in X : a \succ y \succ b \text{ or } b \succ y \succ a\}.$$

Given arbitrary alternatives a and b and profile r, Lemma 5-2 exhibits a technique for moving alternatives around to reduce $\sigma(r,a,b)$ without changing the selected alternative. Given $j \in N$ and $r \in NP(n,m+1)$ with $a \succ_{r(j)} b$ we say that profile s is obtained from r by moving b up in $r(j)$ but not above a (resp., moving a down in $r(j)$ but not below b) if b ranks higher in $s(j)$ than in $r(j)$ (resp., a ranks lower in $s(j)$ than in $r(j)$), and $s(i) = r(i)$ for all $i \in N\backslash\{j\}$, and a ranks above b in $s(j)$. The proof of the lemma only considers modifications to $r(j)$ that do not change the position of any alternative above a or below b in $r(j)$, to ensure that the selected alternative does not change. Such modifications will yield enough information to allow us to prove, in the subsequent lemma, that the range of g^* is X^*.

Lemma 5-2: Given $j \in N$, $r \in NP(n,m+1)$, and $a,b \in X$ such that $a \succ_{r(j)} b$, let Y denote the set $\{y \in X : a \succ_{r(j)} y \succ_{r(j)} b\}$.

1. If $g(r) \notin Y$ and there exists no $u \in NP(n,m+1)$ such that $g(u) = g(r)$ and u is obtained from r by moving b up in $r(j)$, and $\sigma_j(u,a,b) < \sigma_j(r,a,b)$ then $b \succ_{r(i)} Y$ holds for all $i \in N\backslash\{j\}$.

2. If $g(r) \notin Y \cup \{a\}$ and there exists no $u \in NP(n,m+1)$ such that $g(u) = g(r)$ and u is obtained from r by moving a down in $r(j)$, and $\sigma_j(u,a,b) < \sigma_j(r,a,b)$ then $Y \succ_{r(i)} a$ holds for all $i \in N\backslash\{j\}$.

Proof: We number the members of Y so that $Y = \{y^1, y^2, ..., y^T\}$ and $y^t \succ_{r(j)} y^{t+1}$ for $t \in \{1,2,...,k-1\}$. Let x denote $g(r)$. We will create profile s from r by switching the order of some alternatives in $r(j)$, keeping $s(i) = r(i)$ for all $i \in N\backslash\{j\}$. We will create $s(j)$ in a way that guarantees $g(s) = g(r) = x$, provided that s belongs to $NP(n,m+1)$. (In proving 1 we will only change the ordering of the members of $Y \cup \{b\}$ relative to each other, and b can only move up relative to any member of Y. Therefore, the set of alternatives preferred to x by person j will not expand, it can only shrink. The fact that $x \notin Y$ makes that easy to check. In proving 2 we will only change the ordering of the members of $Y \cup \{a\}$ relative to each other. We will move a down relative to some or all members of Y but not in a way that changes the set of alternatives preferred to x by person j.)

Create profile s from r by switching y^T and b in $r(j)$. If $s \in NP(n,m+1)$ then we have $g(s) = x$ and $\sigma_j(s,a,b) < \sigma_j(r,a,b)$. If $s \notin NP(n,m+1)$ then $b \succ_{r(i)} y^T$ for all $i \in N\backslash\{j\}$. Suppose that we have $b \succ_{r(i)} y^t$ for $t = \ell, \ell+1, ..., T$

and all $i \in N\backslash\{j\}$. If $y^k \succ_{r(i)} y^{\ell-1}$ holds for some $k \geq \ell$ and all $i \in N\backslash\{j\}$ then transitivity implies that $b \succ_{r(i)} y^t$ holds for $t = \ell - 1, \ell, \ell+1, ..., T$ and all $i \in N\backslash\{j\}$. Suppose that for each $t \in \{\ell, \ell+1, ..., T\}$ we have $y^{\ell-1} \succ_{r(i)} y^t$ for some $i \in N\backslash\{j\}$. Then we can create $q(j)$ from $r(j)$ by moving $y^{\ell-1}$ down until it ranks just above b, keeping $r(j)$ otherwise unchanged. If $q(i) = r(i)$ for all $i \in N\backslash\{j\}$ then we have $q \in NP(n, m+1)$ and $g(q) = x$. Now create u from q by switching $y^{\ell-1}$ and b in $q(j)$, leaving q otherwise unchanged. If $u \in NP(n, m+1)$ then we have $g(u) = x$ and $\sigma_j(u, a, b) < \sigma_j(r, a, b)$. If $u \notin NP(n, m+1)$ then $b \succ_{r(i)} y^{\ell-1}$ for all $i \in N\backslash\{j\}$. If this process of moving y^ℓ down in person j's ordering for successively smaller values of ℓ does not yield a profile $u \in NP(n, m+1)$ such that $g(u) = x$ and $\sigma_1(u, a, b) < \sigma_1(r, a, b)$ then we will have established that

$$b \succ_{r(i)} y^t \text{ for all } t \in \{1, 2, ..., T\} \text{ and all } i \in N\backslash\{j\}.$$

If we do find the desired profile u then $\{x' \in X : x' \succ_{u(j)} x\} = \{x' \in X : x' \succ_{r(j)} x\}$ if $x \neq b$ and $\{x' \in X : x' \succ_{u(j)} x\} \subset \{x' \in X : x' \succ_{r(j)} x\}$ if $x = b$, and hence $g(u) = x$.

2. Again we create profile s from r by changing the order of one or more alternatives in $r(j)$, keeping $s(i) = r(i)$ for all $i \in N\backslash\{j\}$. Because we create s by lifting a member of Y just above alternative a we cannot guarantee that $x = g(r)$ will still be selected unless $x \notin Y \cup \{a\}$.

Create profile s from r by switching y^1 and a in $r(j)$. If $s \in NP(n, m+1)$ then we have $g(s) = x$ and $\sigma_1(s, a, b) < \sigma_1(r, a, b)$. If $s \notin NP(n, m+1)$ then $y^1 \succ_{r(i)} a$ for all $i \in N\backslash\{j\}$. We can proceed as we did in Part 1 but we must apply the proof of Part 1 to the inverse of $r(i)$ for all $i \in N$ — i.e., turn the orderings of r upside down — and with alternative a in the role of alternative b. That is, of we let $r'(i)$ denote the inverse of $r(i)$ for each $i \in N$, and set $a' = b$ and $b' = a$ then we can apply the proof of part 1 to r', a', and b' by moving b' up in $r'(j)$. But we also have to change the names of the members of Y so that

$$a \succ_{r(j)} y^T \succ_{r(j)} y^{T-1} \succ_{r(j)} ... \succ_{r(j)} y^2 \succ_{r(j)} y^1 \succ_{r(j)} b.$$

We will either find a profile $u \in NP(n, m+1)$ with $g(u) = x$, $u(i) = r(i)$ for $i \in N\backslash\{j\}$, and $\sigma_1(u, a, b) < \sigma_1(r, a, b)$ or else we will establish that

$$y^t \succ_{r(i)} a \text{ holds for all } t \in \{1, 2, ..., T\} \text{ and all } i \in N\backslash\{j\}.$$

If we do find the desired profile u then $\{x' \in X : x' \succ_{u(j)} x\} = \{x' \in X : x' \succ_{r(j)} x\}$ and hence $g(u) = x$. $\square$

The social choice function g^* derived from g is defined for two fixed alternatives w and z. Therefore, the remaining lemma will refer to $\sigma_i(p)$ instead of $\sigma_i(p, w, z)$. We let $\sigma(p)$ denote the sum of the $\sigma_i(p)$:

$$\sigma(p) = \sigma_1(p) + \sigma_2(p) + ... + \sigma_{n-1}(p) + \sigma_n(p).$$

Proof of Lemma 5-1: To establish that the range of g^* is X^* let r be an arbitrary profile in $NP(n, m+1)$. It suffices to prove that if $g(r) \in X\backslash\{w, z\}$

and $\sigma(r) > 0$ there is a profile $u \in NP(n, m+1)$ such that $g(u) = g(r)$ and $\sigma(u) < \sigma(r)$, and if $g(r) \in \{w, z\}$ there is a profile $u \in NP(n, m+1)$ such that g(u) $\in$ {w,z} and $\sigma(u) < \sigma(r)$.

Choose $x \in X$ and some profile $r \in NP(n, m+1)$ such that $g(r) = x$. Suppose that $\sigma(r) > 0$.

Case 1: There exists $j \in N$ such that $\sigma_j(r) \geq \sigma_i(r)$ for all $i \in N\backslash\{j\}$ and, $X \notin \{w, z\}$ and for any $y \in X$, $w \succ_{r(j)} y \succ_{r(j)} z$ or $z \succ_{r(j)} y \succ_{r(j)} w$ implies $y \neq x$.

Without loss of generality $w \succ_{r(j)} z$. Let $Y = \{y \in X : w \succ_{r(j)} y \succ_{r(j)} z\}$. If we create s from r by moving w down in $r(j)$, but not below z, or moving z up in $r(j)$, but not above z and s belongs to $NP(n, m+1)$ then $g(s) = x$ because $x \notin Y \cup \{w, z\}$. It follows that if we cannot find a profile $u \in NP(n, m+1)$ such that $g(u) = x$, $u(i) = r(i)$ for all $i \in N\backslash\{j\}$, and $\sigma(u) < \sigma(r)$ then we have

$$z \succ_{r(i)} Y \succ_{r(i)} w \text{ for all } i \in N\backslash\{j\}$$

by Lemma 5-2. Because $\sigma_j(r) \geq \sigma_i(r)$ for all $i \in N\backslash\{j\}$, all of the alternatives ranking between z and w in $r(i)$ must belong to Y for each $i \in N\backslash\{j\}$. Choose any $h \in N\backslash\{j\}$. Let y^* be the alternative just above w in $r(h)$. Create u from r by switching y^* and w in $r(h)$ leaving everything else unchanged. We have $u \in NP(n, m+1)$ because $n > 2$. Then $g(u) = x$ because x does not belong to $Y \cup \{w, z\}$., and $\sigma(u) < \sigma(r)$ because we have moved w closer to z in person h's ordering.

Case 2: $x \in Y$ for Y defined at the beginning of Case 1. (Note that $x \notin \{w, z\}$.)

The remainder of the proof of Lemma 5 does not actually require $\sigma_j(r) \geq \sigma_i(r)$ for all $i \in N\backslash\{j\}$. This is important because we will have different individuals playing the role of person j. We have $w \succ_{r(j)} x \succ_{r(j)} z$. Let $A = \{a \in X : w \succ_{r(j)} a \succ_{r(j)} x\}$ and $B = \{b \in X : x \succ_{r(j)} b \succ_{r(j)} z\}$. Then $w \succ_{r(j)} A \succ_{r(j)} x \succ_{r(j)} B \succ_{r(j)} z$. We can assume that we have moved x up as far as possible in person j's ordering without creating Pareto dominance, and without moving it above w.

Part 1: $A \neq \varnothing$.

Then $x \succ_{r(i)} A$ for all $i \in N\backslash\{j\}$ by Lemma 5-2. If we can move w down in $r(j)$ then we can reduce σ. Otherwise $A \succ_{r(i)} w$ for all $i \in N\backslash\{j\}$. We can reduce σ if we can move z up in $r(j)$. Otherwise $z \succ_{r(i)} B$ for all $i \in N\backslash\{j\}$. Therefore, we assume that

$$x \succ_{r(i)} A \succ_{r(i)} w \text{ and } z \succ_{r(i)} B \text{ for all } i \in N\backslash\{j\}.$$

Let a^i denote the member of A that ranks lowest in $r(i)$.

(I) Suppose there exists $h \in N$ such that $z \succ_{r(h)} w$ and $a^h \succ_{r(h)} w$, and no member of X ranks between a^h and w in $r(h)$.

Clearly, $z \notin A$ and $x \succ_{r(h)} A \succ_{r(h)} w$ and hence $z \succ_{r(h)} a^h \succ_{r(h)} w$. Now move a^h just below w in $r(h)$. Alternative x will be selected at the new profile, which belongs to $NP(n.m+1)$ because $n > 2$ and $A \succ_{r(i)} w$ for all $i \in N\backslash\{j\}$. We have thereby reduced σ.

(II) Suppose there exists $h \in N$ such that $z \succ_{r(h)} w$ and $a^h \succ_{r(h)} w$ and $z \succ_{r(h)} a^h \succ_{r(h)} C \succ_{r(h)} w$, with $C = \{c \in X : a^h \succ_{r(h)} c \succ_{r(h)} w\} \neq \varnothing$.

Note that $A \cap C = \varnothing$ by definition of a^h. If we can move w up in $r(h)$ above some members of C then we can reduce σ without changing the selected alternative. ($x \succ_{r(h)} a^h \succ_{r(h)} C \succ_{r(h)} w$ and thus $x \notin C$.) If we cannot reduce σ in this manner then $w \succ_{r(i)} C$ for all $i \in N\backslash\{h\}$ by Lemma 5-2. Then $A \succ_{r(i)} C$ for all $i \in N\backslash\{h, j\}$. We can thus create r' from r by moving all of the members of C above a^h in $r(h)$ without creating Pareto domination, and without changing σ, provided that $r'(h)|C = r(h)|C$. Then (I) holds if we replace r in that statement with r', and hence there exists $u \in NP(n, m+1)$ such that $\sigma(u) < \sigma(r') = \sigma(r)$.

(III) But suppose that $z \succ_{r(h)} w$ and $x \succ_{r(h)} a^h \succ_{r(h)} C^1 \succ_{r(h)} z \succ_{r(h)} C^2 \succ_{r(h)} w$, with C^1 (resp., C^2) containing all of the alternatives ranking between a^h and z (resp., z and w).

Note that C (from statement II) equals $C^1 \cup C^2 \cup \{z\}$. Suppose that $C^2 \neq \varnothing$. If we can move w up or z down in $r(h)$, without causing Pareto dominance and without letting z rank above w, then we can reduce σ. If we cannot reduce σ in this matter we have $w \succ_{r(i)} C^2 \succ_{r(i)} z$ for all i $\in$ N\{h} by Lemma 5-2. Clearly, $C^2 \cap A = \varnothing$, so $x \succ_{r(j)} C^2$ because $w \succ_{r(j)} C^2$ and A contains all of the alternatives ranking between w and x in $r(j)$. We have $x \succ_{r(h)} C^2$, and for all $i \in N\backslash\{h, j\}$ we have

$$x \succ_{r(i)} A \succ_{r(i)} w \succ_{r(i)} C^2.$$

Thus, x Pareto dominates the members of C^2, contradicting $r \in NP(n, m+1)$. Therefore, $C^2 = \varnothing$ if we cannot reduce σ by moving w up or z down in $r(h)$.

Statement III and $C^2 = \varnothing$ imply that there exists $a^h \in A$ such that

$x \succ_{r(h)} a^h \succ_{r(h)} C \succ_{r(h)} z \succ_{r(h)} w$ and z and w are contiguous in $r(h)$, and

C contains all of the alternatives ranking between a^h and z.

Of course, $C \cap A = \varnothing$. Let b^h denote the highest ranking member of B in $r(h)$. Recall that $z \succ_{r(i)} B$ for all $i \in N\backslash\{j\}$ and hence $w \succ_{r(h)} B$ because w and z are contiguous in $r(h)$ and $w \notin B$ by definition.

(IV) II and $w \succ_{r(h)} b^h$ both hold, and no member of X ranks between w and b^h in $r(h)$,

Create profile q from r by setting $q(i) = r(i)$ for all $i \in N\backslash\{j\}$ and setting $q(j)|B = r(h)^{-1}|B$, with each member of $X\backslash B$ occupying the same position in

$q(j)$ as in $r(j)$. Then $\sigma(q) = \sigma(r)$ and $q \in NP(n, m+1)$ and b^h is the lowest ranking member of B in $q(j)$. Obviously, $g(q) = x$ and $\sigma(q) = \sigma(r)$. Now, create s from q by moving b^h just above z in $q(h)$ while preserving the position of every member of $X\backslash\{b^h, z, w\}$ in $q(h) = r(h)$. Then $s \in NP(n, m+1)$ because $w \succ_{r(j)} B$, and $n > 2$ and $z \succ_{r(i)} B$ for all $i \in N\backslash\{j\}$. And $g(s) = x$ because $x \succ_{r(h)} a^h \succ_{r(h)} z$. Now we switch z and b^h in $s(j) = q(j)$. This new profile belongs to $NP(n, m+1)$ and it will have a lower value of σ than profile q.

But suppose that at least one member of $X\backslash B$ ranks between w and b^h in $r(h)$. Then we have

(V) $x \succ_{r(h)} a^h \succ_{r(h)} z \succ_{r(h)} w \succ_{r(h)} D \succ_{r(h)} b^h$, and z and w are contiguous in $r(h)$.

Here $D = \{y \in X : w \succ_{r(h)} y \succ_{r(h)} b^h\} \neq \varnothing$. If we can't move b^h above a member of D without creating Pareto domination then we have $b^h \succ_{r(i)} D$ for all $i \in N\backslash\{h\}$. Alternative b^h is the highest ranking member of B in $r(h)$. Therefore, $D \succ_{r(h)} b^h$ implies $D \cap B = \varnothing$. Hence $b^h \succ_{r(j)} D$ and $B \succ_{r(j)} z$ imply $z \succ_{r(j)} D$. We have $z \succ_{r(h)} D$ and, for all $i \in N\backslash\{h, j\}$, $z \succ_{r(i)} B$ and $b^h \succ_{r(i)} D$ and thus $z \succ_{r(i)} D$. Therefore, z Pareto dominates D, contradicting $D \neq \varnothing$. Hence, IV holds if we can't move b^h above a member of D without creating Pareto domination. As we have seen, this implies the existence of a profile with a lower value of σ than r but with alternative x still being selected.

If we can move b^h above a member of D then we will have statement V with a new profile in the role of r and a proper subset D' of D substituting for D. We then apply the argument of the previous paragraph, eventually arriving at statement IV with a new profile r'' in place of r, and with $\sigma(r'') = \sigma(r)$. This implies the existence of a profile u such that $\sigma(u) < \sigma(r)$ and $g(u) = x$.

Part 2: $A = \varnothing$

If $\sigma(r) > 0$ and for some $i \in N$ there exists an $a \in X$ such that $w \succ_{r(i)} a \succ_{r(i)} x \succ_{r(i)} z$ or $z \succ_{r(i)} a \succ_{r(i)} x \succ_{r(i)} w$ the argument of Part 1 implies that there exists a profile in $NP(n, m+1)$ with a lower value of σ than $\sigma(r)$. (Part 1 assumed that $w \succ_{r(j)} a \succ_{r(j)} x \succ_{r(j)} z$ holds for some $j \in N$ but by switching the roles of w and z we can also establish the existence of a profile u such that $\sigma(u) < \sigma(r)$ and $g(u) = x$ if we know that $z \succ_{r(i)} a \succ_{r(i)} x \succ_{r(i)} w$ holds for some $i \in N$.)

Let $J = \{i \in N : w \succ_{r(i)} z\}$ and $H = \{i \in N : z \succ_{r(i)} w\}$. Of course, $J \neq \varnothing \neq H$.

We may assume that for any $j \in J$ there is no $a \in X$ such that $w \succ_{r(j)} a \succ_{r(j)} x$ and for any $h \in H$ there is no $a \in X$ such that $z \succ_{r(h)} a \succ_{r(h)} x$.

If $j \in J$, let $A^j = \{a \in X : w \succ_{r(j)} a \succ_{r(j)} z\}$ and if $h \in H$ and $A^h = \{a \in X : z \succ_{r(h)} a \succ_{r(h)} w\}$.

We have the following:

If $x \in A^j$ and $j \in J$ we have $w \succ_{r(j)} x \succ_{r(j)} A^j \backslash \{x\} \succ_{r(i)} z$. ($w$ and x are contiguous in $r(j)$.)

If $x \in A^h$ and $h \in H$ we have $z \succ_{r(h)} x \succ_{r(h)} A^h \backslash \{x\} \succ_{r(h)} w$. ($z$ and x are contiguous in $r(h)$.)

Choose any $j \in J$. Suppose that $A^j \neq \varnothing$ and $x \notin A^j$.

If we cannot reduce σ by moving z up in $r(j)$, but not above w, or w down (note that x would still be selected as a result) then $z \succ_{r(i)} A^j \succ_{r(i)} w$ for all $i \in N \backslash \{j\}$ by Lemma 5-2. Hence $z \succ_{r(i)} w$ for all $i \in N \backslash \{j\}$, and thus $H = N \backslash \{j\}$ and $A^j \subset A^i$ for all $i \in H$. Therefore, $A^i \neq \varnothing$ for any $i \in H$. Suppose $x \notin A^h$ and $h \in H$. If we cannot move w up or z down without changing the selected alternative or creating Pareto domination we have $w \succ_{r(i)} A^h \succ_{r(i)} z$, and thus $w \succ_{r(i)} z$, for all $i \in N \backslash \{h\}$. This contradicts $n > 2$ and $H = N \backslash \{j\}$. Therefore,

$j \in J$ and $x \notin A^j \neq \varnothing$ implies $H = N \backslash \{j\}$ and $x \in A^h$ for all $h \in H$.

Continuing to assume that $x \notin A^j \neq \varnothing$, we have

$z \succ_{r(i)} x \succ_{r(i)} A^i \backslash \{x\} \succ_{r(i)} w$, and z and x are contiguous in $r(i)$, for all $i \in H = N \backslash \{j\}$.

Choose any $h \in H$ and any $a \in A^j$. Then $a \neq x$. Because $A^j \subset A^i$ for all $i \in H$ we have $z \succ_{r(i)} a \succ_{r(i)} w$ for all $i \in H$.

Choose any two distinct h and $k \in H$. If we cannot reduce σ by moving w up in $r(k)$ without changing the selected alternative then $w \succ_{r(i)} A^k$ holds for all $i \in N \backslash \{k\}$. But $a \in A^k$ and thus we have $z \succ_{r(h)} a \succ_{r(h)} w \succ_{r(h)} a$, contradicting transitivity of $r(h)$.

We are forced to conclude that for all $i \in N$, if $A^i \neq \varnothing$ then $x \in A^i$. (If $z \succ_{r(i)} A^i \succ_{r(i)} w$ and $x \notin A^j \neq \varnothing$ then we also arrive at a contradiction if we assume that we cannot reduce σ without changing the selected alternative.) We are assuming that $A = \varnothing$ which means that $w \succ_{r(i)} x$ and w and x are contiguous in $r(i)$ for all $i \in J$, and $z \succ_{r(i)} x$ and z and x are contiguous in $r(i)$ for all $i \in H$. For $i \in J$, let $B^i = \{b \in X : x \succ_{r(i)} b \succ_{r(i)} z\}$, and for $i \in H$ let $B^i = \{b \in X : x \succ_{r(i)} b \succ_{r(i)} w\}$. If $j \in J$ and we cannot reduce σ by moving z up in $r(j)$ without changing the selected alternative then $z \succ_{r(h)} B^j$ for all $h \in N \backslash \{j\}$. If $h \in H$ and we cannot reduce σ by moving w up in $r(h)$ without changing the selected alternative then $w \succ_{r(j)} B^h$ for all $j \in N \backslash \{h\}$. Therefore

$z \succ_{r(h)} B^j$ for all $j \in J$ and $h \in H$, and

$w \succ_{r(j)} B^h$ for all $j \in J$ and $h \in H$.

Suppose that $B^j \neq \varnothing$ for some $j \in J$. Let b^* denote the member of B^j ranked lowest in $r(j)$. If $i \in J$ and $b^* \succ_{r(i)} w$ then $b^* \succ_{r(i)} z$ and we can switch z and b^* in r(j) thus reducing σ without changing the selected alternative or creating Pareto domination. Therefore, we may assume $w \succ_{r(i)} b^*$ for all $i \in J$. Because w and x are contiguous in $r(i)$ for all $i \in J$ we have $x \succ_{r(i)} b^*$ for all

$i \in J$. Then $x \succ_{r(i)} b^*$ for all $i \in N$ because $z \succ_{r(h)} B^j$for all $h \in H$, and z and x are contiguous in $r(h)$ for all $h \in H$. Similarly, if $B^h \neq \varnothing$ for some $h \in H$ then there is an instance of Pareto domination at profile r.

Assume, then, that there exist $j \in J$ and $h \in H$ such that $B^j \cap B^h \neq \varnothing$. For $b \in B^j \cap B^h$and $j \in J$ we have $w \succ_{r(j)} x \succ_{r(j)} b \succ_{r(j)} z \succ_{r(j)} b$, contradicting transitivity. (Note that $x \succ_{r(j)} b$ holds because $j \in J$ and $b \in B^j$. And $z \succ_{r(j)} b$ holds because $h \in H$ and $b \in B^h$.)

Therefore, if we can't reduce σ without changing the selected alternative we have

$$w \succ_{r(j)} x \succ_{r(j)} z \text{ for all } j \in J \text{ and } z \succ_{r(h)} x \succ_{r(h)} w \text{ for all } h \in H,$$

and

for all $j \in J$ and all $y \in X\backslash\{w, x, z\}$, if $w \succ_{r(j)} y \succ_{r(j)} z$ then $y = x$, and

for all $h \in H$ and all $y \in X\backslash\{w, x, z\}$, if $z \succ_{r(h)} y \succ_{r(h)} w$ then $y = x$.

(No alternatives rank between w and x or between x and z for any $i \in N$.)

We now use g and r to define a social choice function μ with domain $NP(n, 3)$ and $X = \{w, x, z\}$. Given profile $\rho \in NP(3, 3)$ let $p \in NP(n, m + 1)$ be the profile for which, for all $i \in N$,

$$p(i)|\{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\} = \rho(i),$$

and for all $y \in X\backslash\{w, x, z\}$ alternative y has the same position in $p(i)$ as $r(i)$.

Refer to p as the extension of ρ. For any $\rho' \in NP(n, 3)$ set $\mu(\rho') = g(p')$ for the extension p' of ρ'.

Suppose that $|H| \geq 2$. Create u from r by switching x and z in $r(h)$ for some $h \in H$. We will have $u \in NP(n, m+1)$ and $g(u) = x$. Now create s from u by switching x and z for some $j \in J$. Create profile t from u by switching x and w for some $h \in H$. If $g(s) = x$ or $g(t) = x$ then we have reduced σ and hence are finished the proof of Case 2. If $g(s) \neq x$ and $g(t) \neq x$ then strategy-proofness of g implies that $g(s) = z$ and $g(t) = w$, in which case the range of μ is $\{x, z, w\}$. Then the rule μ is dictatorial because $m = 3$. If at ρ' the dictator has x ranked above both w and z and the other members of N have the opposite ranking of the three alternatives we will have $\mu(\rho') = x$. Because g is strategy proof it will select x at the extension of ρ'. Because x ranks between w and z in $r(i)$ for each $i \in N$ we have reduced σ. Similarly, if $|J| \geq 2$ we can reduce σ, without changing the selected alternative x.

Case 3: $x \in \{w, z\}$.

To prove that x^* is in the range of g^* we only need to show that a member of $\{w, z\}$ is selected by g at some profile in $NP*(n, m+1)$. Let r be any profile in $NP(n, m+1)$ such that $g(r) = w$.

Suppose that for any $i \in N$ such that $w \succ_{r(i)} z$ the alternatives w and z are contiguous in $r(i)$. Then $\sigma(r) > 0$ implies that there exists $h \in N$ such that $z \succ_{r(h)} C \succ_{r(h)} w$ for some nonempty subset C of $X\backslash\{w, z\}$. If there is no profile $u \in NP(n, m+1)$ such that $g(u) = w$ and $\sigma(u) < \sigma(r)$ then we cannot create a profile u from r by moving w up in $r(j)$ (ensuring that w will still be selected) and hence, by Lemma 5-2, we have $w \succ_{r(i)} C$ for all $i \in N\backslash\{h\}$. Then $w \succ_{r(i)} z$ implies $w \succ_{r(i)} z \succ_{r(i)} C$ because $w \succ_{r(i)} C$ and w and z are contiguous in $r(i)$. And $z \succ_{r(i)} w$ for $i \neq h$ implies $z \succ_{r(i)} w \succ_{r(i)} C$ and hence $z \succ_{r(i)} C$. We also have $z \succ_{r(h)} C$ and thus $z \succ_{r(i)} C$ for all $i \in N$, contradicting $C \neq \varnothing$ and $r \in NP(n, m+1)$. We have proved that if $w \succ_{r(i)} z$ implies that w and z are contiguous in $r(i)$ then $\sigma(r) = 0$.

Suppose then that there exists $j \in N$ such that $w \succ_{r(j)} z$ and w and z are not contiguous in $r(j)$. Let Y denote the nonempty set $\{y \in X : w \succ_{r(j)} y \succ_{r(j)} z\}$. If we cannot create a profile $u \in NP(n, m+1)$ from r by moving z up in $r(j)$ but not above w — guaranteeing that the selected alternative does not change and σ decreases — then, by Lemma 5-2, we have $z \succ_{r(i)} Y$ for all $i \neq j$. If for any $i \in N$ such that $z \succ_{r(i)} w$ the alternatives w and z are contiguous in $r(i)$ then $z \succ_{r(i)} w$ implies $z \succ_{r(i)} w \succ_{r(i)} Y$ because $z \succ_{r(i)} Y$. If $w \succ_{r(i)} z$ and $i \neq j$ then $w \succ_{r(i)} z \succ_{r(i)} Y$ and hence $w \succ_{r(i)} Y$. Because $Y \neq \varnothing$ and we also have $w \succ_{r(j)} Y$ we have contradicted the fact that r exhibits no Pareto domination. Therefore, there exists $k \in N\backslash\{j\}$ such that $z \succ_{r(k)} D \succ_{r(k)} w$ for some nonempty subset D of X. If there is no profile $u \in NP(n, m+1)$ such that $g(u) = w$ and $\sigma(u) < \sigma(r)$ then we cannot create a profile u from r by moving w up (ensuring that w will still be selected) or z down in r(k) then, by Lemma 5-2, we have $w \succ_{r(i)} D \succ_{r(i)} z$ for all $i \in N\backslash\{k\}$. In particular, $w \succ_{r(j)} D \succ_{r(j)} z$ and hence $D \subset Y$. But $n > 2$, and for $i \in N\backslash\{j, k\}$ we have $w \succ_{r(i)} D \succ_{r(i)} z \succ_{r(i)} Y$, contradicting transitivity of $r(i)$ and the fact that D is a nonempty subset of Y. Therefore, there must exist a profile $u \in NP(n, m+1)$ such that $g(u) = w$ and $\sigma(u) < \sigma(r)$. □

References

Barberà S, Berga D, Moreno B (2010) "Individual versus group strategy-proofness: When do they coincide?" *J Econ Theory* 145: 1648-1674.

Campbell DE, Kelly JS (2010a) "Losses due to the manipulation of social choice rules," *Econ Theory*, 45: 453-467.

Campbell DE, Kelly JS (2014a) Universally beneficial manipulation: a characterization," *Soc. Choice and Welf.*, 43: 329-355.

Campbell DE, Kelly JS (2014b) "Strategy-proofness on the Non-Paretian Subdomain".

Campbell: Department of Economics and The Program in Public Policy,
The College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA 23187-8795, USA
E-mail: decamp@wm.edu

Kelly: Department of Economics, Syracuse University,
Syracuse, NY 13244-1020, USA
E-mail: jskelly@maxwell.syr.edu